

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 5146. A bill relating to the performance, by Federal judges, of services for the United States not related to their judicial duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H. R. 5147. A bill to grant to enlisted personnel of the armed forces certain benefits in lieu of accumulated leave; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 5148. A bill to provide for the payment of pension or other benefits withheld from persons for the period they were residing in countries occupied by the enemy forces during World War II; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 5149. A bill to govern the effective dates of ratings and awards under the veterans' administration revised schedule for rating disabilities, 1945, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. ROE of Maryland:

H. R. 5150. A bill to authorize a survey to determine the advisability of widening and deepening the channel in a certain part of North East River, Cecil County, Md.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 5151. A bill to establish a chief of chaplains in the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. Res. 485. Resolution providing for study of food subsidies; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. Res. 486. Resolution to provide for a study of Government policy with respect to subsidies affecting food prices; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Ohio:

H. Res. 487. Resolution creating a select committee to make a thorough investigation of the announced slow-down of the War Department's demobilization program; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 5152. A bill for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Powers; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5153. A bill for the relief of Annie L. Taylor and William Benjamin Taylor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 5154. A bill for the relief of Harley Shores; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 5155. A bill to authorize the award of a medal to Clyde Pangborn and Hugh Herndon, Jr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 5156. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Fiorentino; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York:

H. R. 5157. A bill for the relief of Nikolaos Tountasakis; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 17, 1946

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of all mercies, in a dark and desperate hour, we turn to Thee with deep needs that only Thou canst meet.

Everywhere in a violent world we hear voices that challenge all that men have counted fixed, final, and sure. In this day of crashing systems, save us from being prophets of gloom and of doom. Through the fiery destruction of the old, may there be vouchsafed to us vistas of a richer and fairer earth to be. Forbid that we should be so blind today that tomorrow all we now labor for prove like stubble to a devouring flame—the foundations we now choose be revealed as but sinking sand. Scorning the cheap cant of secular panaceas, give us to see that we cannot house our spirits even in ornate barns—that really to live we must build more stately mansions for our souls. We ask it through riches of grace in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF SENATORS

STYLES BRIDGES, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire; HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, a Senator from the State of South Dakota; HUGH BUTLER, a Senator from the State of Nebraska; HARRY FLOOD BYRD, a Senator from the State of Virginia; HOMER E. CAPEHART, a Senator from the State of Indiana; GUY CORDON, a Senator from the State of Oregon; SHERIDAN DOWNEY, a Senator from the State of California; CHARLES C. GOSSETT, a Senator from the State of Idaho; JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, a Senator from the State of Pennsylvania; CHAN GURNEY, a Senator from the State of South Dakota; BURNET R. MAYBANK, a Senator from the State of South Carolina; ERNEST W. MCFARLAND, a Senator from the State of Arizona; JAMES M. MEAD, a Senator from the State of New York; FRANCIS J. MYERS, a Senator from the State of Pennsylvania; JOHN H. OVERTON, a Senator from the State of Louisiana; CHAPMAN REVERCOMB, a Senator from the State of West Virginia; LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, a Senator from the State of Massachusetts; HENRIK SHIPSTEAD, a Senator from the State of Minnesota; CHARLES W. TOBEY, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire; and MILTON R. YOUNG, a Senator from the State of North Dakota, appeared in their seats today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 14, 1946, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. WHITE advanced to the center of the aisle, and Mr. BARKLEY said: Mr. President, I wish to announce that the committee appointed by the President pro tempore to wait upon the President and inform him that the Congress is in session has performed that duty, and the President advises that he hopes to communicate with the Congress about next Monday.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that

a quorum of the House was present and that the House was ready to proceed with business.

The message also informed the Senate that Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, had been elected Speaker pro tempore of the House of Representatives during the absence of the Speaker.

The message announced that a committee of three Members had been appointed by the Speaker pro tempore, on the part of the House of Representatives, to join with the committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House had assembled and that Congress was ready to receive any communication that he might be pleased to make.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3603) to provide for the sale of surplus war-built vessels, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BLAND, Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas, Mr. BOYKIN, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Joseph W. Ervin, late a Representative from the State of North Carolina, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on January 11, 1946, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 90) for the relief of the estate of George O'Hara.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF EDWARD S. KAMPF, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, notice is hereby given that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, January 24, 1946, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room in the Capitol Building, upon the nomination of Edward S. Kampf, of New York, to be United States district judge for the northern district of New York, vice Frederick H. Bryant, deceased. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee in charge consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF NATHAN CAYTON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE CHIEF JUDGE, MUNICIPAL COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, notice is hereby given that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, January 24, 1946, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room in the Capitol Building,

upon the nomination of Nathan Cayton, of the District of Columbia, to be chief judge of the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, vice William E. Richardson, deceased. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee in charge consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ROY M. SHELBOURNE, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, notice is hereby given that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, January 24, 1946, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room in the Capitol Building, upon the nomination of Roy M. Shelbourne, of Kentucky, to be United States district judge for the western district of Kentucky, vice Shackelford Miller, Jr., elevated. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee in charge consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

PRESERVATION OF AMERICAN LIBERTIES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, because of official duties, I was obliged to remain in Washington throughout the holidays.

A day or so after Christmas, after finishing the day's mail, I strolled over to the Library of Congress and asked to be shown around. I wanted to see the original Declaration of Independence and the Magna Carta. As I stood before these documents, encased behind glass and steel, with my inward eye I seemed to witness the significant historical events which led up to their coming into being. King John, a tyrant, was forced to set down in writing, under his seal and signature, a guaranty of human rights. Americans, because of another tyrant, set down in writing their concepts of man's inherent rights.

As I stood there, my attention was sharply focused to the fact that guards were standing nearby in uniform, watching, guarding, and as I left the Congressional Library and sauntered back to my office, this conclusion flashed upon my mind: "We must ever remain on guard." Even the written instruments setting forth man's accomplishments had to be guarded. That is just what we were not doing at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941. We were asleep.

Yes, we have to remain on guard against present-day tyranny. We have to remain on guard and see to it—

(a) That the constitutional rights of majorities and individuals are protected. We have always contended for the protection of minorities.

(b) We have to remain on guard and see that the American dollar is kept in-

tact. Otherwise the insurance policies, savings, and United States war bonds will be valueless.

(c) We have to keep on guard and see to it that racketeers, synthetic thinkers in our society, do not take over Government.

(d) We have to keep on guard and see to it that in the international picture, chaos does not return to the world.

(e) We have to keep on guard and see to it that the spenders, the chiselers, and the grafters, do not determine the economic, and political policies of this Government.

Remember, there had to be guards to protect the sheets of paper on which were written the Magna Carta and the Declaration of Independence. How clearly this sets forth that America must remain alert, constantly alert. That is the lesson we should never forget.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED RESCISSIONS AND PROVISIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS AND CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

A communication from the President of the United States, together with a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, proposed rescissions and provisions relating to war and war-related appropriations and contract authorizations (with the accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

TAX REFUNDS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of refunds of internal revenue in excess of \$500 made by the Bureau of Internal Revenue during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945, on account of taxes illegally or erroneously collected, showing the names and addresses of the individual taxpayers and the amounts refunded (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

PERSHING HALL, PARIS, FRANCE, EXPENDITURE REPORT

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, an itemized report of transactions for account of the Pershing Hall Memorial Fund for the fiscal year 1945 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

MEN IN TRAINING UNDER SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940

A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the number of men in active training and service on October 31, 1945, in the land forces under section 3 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ENLISTMENTS AND REENLISTMENTS IN REGULAR ARMY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 190 (79th Cong.), the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945, a report showing the number of enlisted men in active duty in the Regular Army as of December 31, 1945, who have been enlisted or reenlisted on or after June 1, 1945; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORT OF NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION (S. Doc. No. 134)

A letter from the Secretary of War, president, National Forest Reservation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Commission for the fiscal

year ended June 30, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

Two letters from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, (1) a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 179 aliens whose deportation was suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension, and (2) withdrawing a certain name from a similar report heretofore transmitted by him (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Immigration.

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 282 aliens whose deportation was suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Immigration.

PENALTY MAIL MATTER

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to section 2 of Public Law 364, approved June 28, 1944, a report showing the quantity of penalty inscribed material on hand and on order on June 30, 1944, the number of pieces procured, estimated mailings, balance on hand June 30, 1945, and estimated cost of handling for the fiscal year 1945 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

ASSISTANT POSTMASTERS GENERAL, AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, and for other purposes, so as to provide permanently for four Assistant Postmaster General, covering expenses in excess of revenues, and legal procedure for disposition of any excess postal revenues (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

FLIGHT PAY OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE NAVY

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting information as to rank and age of officers above the rank of lieutenant commander in the Navy on duty involving flying, with the average monthly flight pay authorized by law to be paid to such officers during the 6 months ended January 1, 1946 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REDUCTION IN NAVAL SHIPBUILDING CONSTRUCTION

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting copies of correspondence with the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, relating to stoppage of construction of certain naval vessels (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

AGREEMENTS BETWEEN THE NAVY DEPARTMENT AND OIL COMPANIES IN OPERATION OF NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVE NO. 1

A letter from the Director, Naval Petroleum Reserves, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of agreements between the Navy Department and various oil companies for development and operation of lands of the United States and sale and purchase of petroleum produced for the Navy's account from unit operation, within Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1, since November 22, 1944, under the provisions of the act of June 30, 1938, as amended by the act of June 17, 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

OPERATIONS UNDER SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUELS ACT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting his report of operations, for the calendar year ended December 31, 1945, under the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act (Public Law 290, 78th Cong.) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

ANNUAL REPORT ON BOULDER CANYON PROJECT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourth annual report and financial statement of operations under section 13 of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, approved July 19, 1940, for the year ended May 31, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

RELIEF OF DESTITUTION OF NATIVES OF ALASKA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering expenditures made from the appropriation, "Education of natives of Alaska, 1944-46," for the relief of destitution of natives of Alaska during the fiscal year 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

LOANS TO INDIAN CHARTERED CORPORATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of loans to Indian chartered corporations and individuals, for the purpose of promoting the economic development of such tribes and individuals, and a report showing the status of credit operations as of June 30, 1945, of the same (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

LAWS PASSED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. CROIX AND MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

Two letters from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix and the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I., respectively (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT AGENCY

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945, covering operations, expenditures, and obligations under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act for that fiscal year (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF OPERATIONS UNDER SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the name, address, and amount of compensation of each person receiving \$1,000 or more under the 1944 program, and a supplemental report under the 1943 program, administered under the provisions of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, and a supplemental list under the 1942 crop parity-payment program (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on forest roads and trails for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATIONS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the receipts and expenditures and work of the agricultural experiment stations in the United States, Hawaii,

Alaska, and Puerto Rico, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

EXPENDITURES AND ACTIVITIES OF REGIONAL RESEARCH LABORATORIES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report for the calendar year 1945 of the activities of, funds used by, and donations to the regional research laboratories established pursuant to section 202 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

EXTENSION SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of receipts, expenditures, and results of cooperative agricultural extension work for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CROP PROGRAM OPERATIONS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 3 of the act of April 12, 1945, by extending the authorization to pay subsidies to include commodities of the 1946 crop (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration covering operations of the Administration for the fiscal year 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF FEDERAL SURPLUS COMMODITIES CORPORATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to section 204 of Public Law 430 (78th Cong.), the annual report of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

FINAL VALUATION OF PROPERTIES OF CERTAIN PIPE-LINE COMPANIES

A letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, final valuations of properties of certain pipe-line companies (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

REPORT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Commission for the period November 1, 1944, to October 31, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

REPORT OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities of the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION REVISED SCHEDULE FOR RATING DISABILITIES, 1945

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed

legislation to govern the effective dates of ratings and awards under the Veterans' Administration revised schedule for rating disabilities, 1945, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF THE UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Commission for the fiscal year 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

EXPENDITURES OF UNITED STATES COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

A letter from the Assistant Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of the expenditures of appropriations for the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JUDGMENTS RENDERED BY COURT OF CLAIMS (S. Doc. No. 133)

A letter from the Chief Clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of all judgments rendered by the Court of Claims for the year ended December 1, 1945, the amount thereof, the parties in whose favor rendered, and a brief synopsis of the nature of the claims (with an accompanying statement); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

A letter from the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

EXPENDITURES OF FUNDS DERIVED FROM THE SALE OF BONDS OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

A letter from the General Manager of the Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the expenditures for the 12 months ended November 30, 1945, of funds derived from the sale of bonds under section 15c of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SMALLER WAR PLANTS CORPORATION

A letter from the Administrator of the Civilian Production Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the twenty-first report of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, under the Smaller War Plants Corporation Act, for the period October 1 to November 30, 1945, submitted to him by the Chairman of the Board of that Corporation (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF SURPLUS PROPERTY ADMINISTRATOR

Six letters from the Administrator of the Surplus Property Administration, transmitting, pursuant to section 19 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, reports on aircraft plants and facilities, aviation gasoline plants and facilities, synthetic rubber plants and facilities, Government-owned pipe lines, transportation facilities, and on patents, processes, techniques and inventories (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

CONTRACTS ENTERED INTO OR MODIFIED BY THE UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of contracts entered into or modified by the United States Maritime Commission under authority of the act of May 2, 1941, for the period October 1 to December 31, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

NAMES AND COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement showing the names and compensation of the members and employees of the Commission as of June 30, 1945 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

PERMITS AND LICENSES ISSUED BY THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a classified report showing the permits and licenses issued by the Commission during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945, the parties thereto, the terms prescribed, the moneys received, if any, and an accounting thereof (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Food and Drug Administration for the fiscal year 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of St. Elizabeths Hospital for the fiscal year 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the American Printing House for the Blind, Columbia Institution for the Deaf, Howard University, Office of Community War Services and Committee on Physical Fitness, for the fiscal year 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

OPERATION OF STANDS IN FEDERAL BUILDINGS BY BLIND PERSONS

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the operation of stands in Federal buildings by blind persons, to enlarge the economic opportunities of the blind, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1936, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

MERITORIOUS SALARY INCREASES OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a consolidated report and supporting data on especially meritorious salary increases of Government employees made by the various departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

REPORT OF CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., of Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the company's operations for the year 1945, the results of the operations for

December of that year being estimated (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

GEORGETOWN BARGE, DOCK, ELEVATOR & RAILWAY CO.

A report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., transmitted, pursuant to law, for the year ended December 31, 1945; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ESTIMATES OF PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

A letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of his determinations during the quarter ended December 31, 1945, of the number of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the executive departments and agencies of the Government (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Civil Service.

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of personnel requirements for the Commission for the quarter ending March 31, 1946 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

A letter from the Chairman of the National Mediation Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a revised estimate of personnel requirements for the National Railroad Adjustment Board for the quarter ending March 31, 1946 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore and referred as indicated:

A resolution adopted by community service members of the policy board under the Philadelphia (Pa.) volunteer price control plan, favoring the enactment of legislation to continue price control for the duration of the existing economic emergency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Resolutions adopted by United Packinghouse Workers of America, Swift Local No. 71, Sioux City, Iowa, and International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, Carquinez Local No. 51, Selby, Calif., favoring the enactment of the bill (S. 1592) to establish a national housing policy and provide for its execution; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Fifth Naval District Metal Trades Council, Portsmouth, Va., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing for the merger of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A telegram in the nature of a memorial from officers and men of the Eighty-third Infantry Division of the United States Army, remonstrating against the delay in discharging members of the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers, Washington, D. C., favoring the enactment of House bill 3615, the so-called airport bill, so as to

include the provision of Senate bill 2, providing for the acquisition of land for airport purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

A petition of sundry citizens of the State of California, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 623, to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages by radio; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A memorial of sundry citizens of the United States remonstrating against the official conduct of Senator THEODORE G. BILBO, of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a resolution of the Chamber of Representatives of Cuba, relating to the solidarity of the nations of the Western Hemisphere (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter from the bishop and the auxiliary bishop, Bishop's Chancery Office, Philadelphia, Pa., appealing in behalf of the Americans of Ukrainian birth or extraction who reside in the United States for the cause of their relatives in Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the New Mexico Oil and Gas Association, Roswell, N. Mex., favoring ratification of the Anglo-American oil agreement; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Conference of Second District Association of Clubs of Altrusa International, at Winston-Salem, N. C., protesting against delays on the part of various nations in bringing about world peace; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A telegram from E. G. Collins, president, Eastern Division Pennsylvania Newspaper Women's Association, Philadelphia, Pa., relative to carrying the names of deceased Senators on the rolls of the Senate as honorary members for their unexpired terms; to the Committee on Rules.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Directors of the Institute of Engineers of Puerto Rico, relating to the salaries paid to experts from funds of the Puerto Rican Treasury Department; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Filipino Federation of America, Inc., Honolulu, T. H., relating to the statehood of Hawaii; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Filipino Federation of America, Inc., Honolulu, T. H., favoring the importation of Filipino laborers to Hawaii; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Filipino Federation of America, Inc., Honolulu, T. H., endorsing Dr. Hilario Camino Moncada, to be President of the Philippines; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Philippine-Hawaii-America Labor Union, Inc., Manila, P. I., relating to the election to be held in the Philippines on April 30, 1945; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Fifth Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I., favoring the confirmation of William H. Hastie to be Governor of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

ADEQUATE AND COMPETITIVE AIR TRANSPORTATION FOR RHODE ISLAND—JOINT RESOLUTION OF RHODE ISLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of Rhode Island, requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to use their influence with the Civil Aeronautics Board to guarantee to the State

of Rhode Island and to the city of Providence adequate and competitive air transportation, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Commerce, and, under the rule, it will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution is as follows:

Joint resolution respectfully requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to use their influence with the civil aeronautics board to guarantee to the State of Rhode Island and to the city of Providence adequate and competitive air transportation

Whereas the State of Rhode Island is one of the most densely populated and one of the wealthiest States in the United States; and

Whereas the Providence metropolitan district ranks fourth in population upon the Atlantic seaboard with Providence the center of a large and thriving industrial area; and

Whereas by reason of its population and industrial activities, the city of Providence is entitled to adequate and competitive airline services commensurate with its size and importance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be and they hereby are urgently requested to use their influence in every way with the Civil Aeronautics Board in order that adequate and competitive air transportation may be guaranteed to the State of Rhode Island and to the city of Providence; and be it further:

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he is hereby authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States and to the members of the Civil Aeronautics Board, since the members of the general assembly, in the interests of the business life of the State, favor aggressive and immediate action that the State of Rhode Island and the city of Providence may share in the benefits of future expansion of air transportation.

PROPOSED CEILING PRICES ON COTTON— RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a concurrent resolution passed by the South Carolina House and Senate.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution requesting the President and the Congress of the United States of America to prohibit ceiling prices being placed upon cotton

Be it resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the President and the Congress of the United States of America are hereby earnestly requested that they do all in their power to prohibit a ceiling price being placed upon the sale and purchase of cotton.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may comment upon the concurrent resolution for 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have sent to the desk a concurrent resolution passed by the Legislature of South Carolina which requests the President and the Congress of the United States to prohibit ceiling prices being placed upon cotton.

On January the 6th, when I first learned of the attempt to place ceiling prices on cotton, I telegraphed the President from South Carolina, and I ask unanimous consent that my telegram sent to the President be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHARLESTON, S. C., January 7, 1946.

The President,

The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I wired you yesterday regarding the unreasonable statement issued by Mr. Bowles that appeared in the papers here, and I am sending you a copy of the statement. It appears to me that such an attempted regulation would be socialistic and unjust and unfair to the cotton farmers of the South. The cotton farmers' income depends upon the yield per acre of his crop that is to be produced this year. The elements and the weather are the main factors after the cotton is planted as to the size of the crop and as to its eventual cost. The farmers are short of labor, fertilizer is expensive, and they have had a most unusual and hard time for the last 4 years. We all know that the world is bare of cotton goods, and it is my judgment, after having seen what I did in the European countries, that the cotton mills of the world could produce at a full rate for at least 5 years to take up the slack and fill the empty shelves of the stores throughout the world. To tell the cotton farmer that he is to be punished simply because manufacturing costs have risen, all of which he has nothing to do with, is unreasonable and unjust. A pound of cotton makes 4 yards of goods, and the increased cost is not the fault of the price of cotton. Cotton prices are way below those that followed the last war, and I earnestly hope in the interest of the southern people you will not permit any such order. With my kindest personal regards,

BURNET R. MAYBANK.

Mr. MAYBANK. I also telegraphed Mr. Chester Bowles regarding the placing of ceiling prices on cotton. I shall not read the telegram, but I ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHARLESTON, S. C., January 12, 1946.

Mr. CHESTER BOWLES,

Chief Price Administrator,

Washington, D. C.:

Have wired the President and do trust that you will not put a ceiling on the price of raw cotton as it cannot be enforced honestly in my opinion because of tremendous difference in value of various grades and staples.

BURNET R. MAYBANK,
United States Senator.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, my reason for sending my telegram was that it was my opinion that, taking into consideration the various grades and staples concerned in the cotton business, it would be impossible to enforce the order.

Yesterday I received a letter from Mr. Bowles which I should like to read. It is as follows:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,

Washington, D. C., January 16, 1946.

The Honorable BURNET R. MAYBANK,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: Thank you for your telegram about the question of ceiling prices on cotton.

As you know, the Emergency Price Control Act as amended provides that before growers' maximum prices are established for an agricultural commodity which is the product of annual or seasonal planting, notice of the proposed maximum prices must be given at least 15 days prior to the normal planting season.

I think you will agree that, as Price Administrator, I would be remiss in my duties if I foreclosed myself from any right to take whatever action seemed necessary with respect to such an agricultural commodity. It was for this reason, and this reason only, that I approved the issuance of the recent notice covering raw cotton during the crop year 1946. Without such a notice, it would have been legally impossible, regardless of circumstances, for us to establish any such maximum prices later in the year. This, and I want to emphasize the point, is only a technical procedure. It has no bearing on the actual question of whether there should or should not be ceiling prices on raw cotton. I sincerely hope that such a program will be unnecessary. However, I could not shut myself off from the opportunity to judge this situation on its merits in the future.

I want you to know that the announcement that we have made does not necessarily indicate a final decision by this office to fix ceiling prices as indicated in the notice, or at any other figures. If it becomes evident that the price of cotton is becoming stabilized because of improvement in supply or other reasons, of course it may not be necessary for the proposed ceiling prices to be put into effect. I am very conscious also of the difficulties which might be encountered in the administration of cotton ceilings. I want to assure you that we are constantly watching the situation and that every relevant factor and circumstance will receive thorough consideration.

Recognizing your knowledge of cotton problems, I appreciate very much your expression of your views on this matter.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES,

Administrator.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. It has been almost impossible on this side to hear what the Senator has been saying.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am sorry; I shall speak louder.

Mr. WHERRY. Was the distinguished Senator discussing the proposed extension of price ceilings on cotton, now contemplated by the Office of Price Administration?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct. I was referring to a letter Mr. Bowles wrote me, in keeping with the order I had seen in the newspapers, and the order which had been issued for price ceilings on cotton for the 1946 crop, the crop to be harvested in August, September, and October, after the extension of the OPA if Congress should extend it.

Mr. WHERRY. Has the order actually been placed in operation, or is it a contemplated order?

Mr. MAYBANK. In substance, the letter says that the reason for the issuance of the order was the law which

makes it necessary, before crops are planted, to issue an order 15 days in advance. The letter further states that the order might not be put into effect. It also states that it is the opinion and hope that it will not be put into effect. But the letter does not state positively that it will not be put into effect. This, of course, would be better.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I have yielded to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for his statement, and for reading the letter, because the statements are informative, and I think the matter should be brought to the attention of the Senate, because while the order is not yet operative, yet all the steps have been taken so that if the Price Administrator feels it is justified, he can put it into operation when the time comes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Provided Congress continues the OPA, and provided it appropriates the money to carry out such an order.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAYBANK. I now yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. The OPA announcement to which the Senator referred suggested, and the Senator stated, that it might not be necessary to put the order into effect. Did not the statement say that the order would not be put into effect provided cotton prices did not go up between now and the summer or early fall, when the crop comes in?

Mr. MAYBANK. The letter does not exactly state that. I quote from the letter:

I sincerely hope that such a program will be unnecessary.

The letter further states:

If it becomes evident that the price of cotton is becoming stabilized because of improvement in supply or other reasons, of course, it may not be necessary for the proposed ceiling prices to be put into effect.

Mr. EASTLAND. But if cotton prices become stabilized at these levels, or if they are rolled back, as OPA is now attempting to do, then the order will not be put into effect. That is my understanding of the announcement.

Mr. MAYBANK. I agree, in part, with what the distinguished Senator from Mississippi says. Let me read this additional line:

I want you to know that the announcement that we have made does not necessarily indicate a final decision by this Office to fix ceiling prices as indicated in the notice.

I might say to the Senator from Mississippi, who well knows the cotton business, that the price of cotton throughout most of the war has been below parity, that the income of the southern cotton farmer is the lowest income of any farm group in the United States, and that the order which was issued practically fixed the price of cotton at parity, while many other crops have sold above parity. Cotton during the war has been below parity, and during the Second World War has been 50 to 100 percent below what it was in World War I.

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished Senator from South Carolina states that this is the first time that cotton has been above parity. I should like to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that in computing parity farm labor costs are not included.

Mr. MAYBANK. With that statement I thoroughly agree.

Mr. EASTLAND. Farm labor costs today are over 300 times as high as they were during the base period on which parity was computed, and because labor costs are so high, cotton today is the cheapest commodity in the United States, and cannot be produced profitably at the price the OPA and Mr. Hillman intend to place on this commodity.

I will say further, Mr. President, that the alleged necessity, as shown in the OPA announcement, for the imposition of ceilings is the fact that wage increases have been allowed to the converters, in particular to Sidney Hillman's Garment Workers' Union, who have just received a 20-percent wage increase. Now they attempt to say that that increase should be taken out of the farmer's pocket by rolling back the price of cotton.

Mr. MAYBANK. I appreciate what the Senator from Mississippi has said about the price of cotton. I well realize that it is too low to enable the farmer to make a profit. I well realize that the South will seriously suffer. I well realize that the order cannot be enforced, and I shall certainly oppose it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President—

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand, Mr. President, that the few minutes I had asked for have expired, and in view of the fact that my statement was interrupted by Senators who wished to ask questions, I now ask unanimous consent that I may continue.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. SALTONSTALL) is recognized.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may continue.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; Mr. President. I wanted to ask the Senator from South Carolina a question. I thought he had asked for and received further extension of time.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes, Mr. President; I should like to have further extension of time in view of the fact that my statement was interrupted by questions from Senators.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and the Senator's request is granted.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not want to go into the merits of the ceiling on cotton. On that subject I am inclined to agree with the Senator from South Carolina. I hope there will be no necessity for such action, but if the OPA

contemplates such action it is obliged to serve this notice in advance of the planting of the crop.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Otherwise it could not put a ceiling on cotton when the time comes for disposing of the crop.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes. Mr. Bowles says that is the reason he served the notice.

Mr. BARKLEY. And the preliminary action taken by OPA, therefore, is precautionary, in order to qualify OPA to put the ceiling on cotton if later on OPA finds it necessary to do so.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct. That is the substance of the letter which I read.

Mr. President, with the permission of the Senate, I should like to conclude with these few remarks for the RECORD, that we of the South know that there are more than 100 different grades of cotton. Those of us who have spent our lives in the South and who are familiar with the cotton business know of the great number of types and grades of cotton, and we know that the mills buy different types of cotton which are not listed as of any particular grade or type.

Mr. President, properly to conduct the cotton industry requires scientific knowledge. It takes years of study to acquire the scientific knowledge necessary successfully to engage in the cotton industry. It would be totally and absolutely impossible to enforce such an order as is proposed to be issued. There would not be enough men connected with the OPA who would have the knowledge necessary to enforce the order. Such an order would simply bring confusion to the cotton industry, and result in unemployment to the textile workers of the South. It would only result in disrupting the operations of the farmers and the entire economy of the South.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from South Carolina has rendered a distinct service by bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate and to the attention of the country. I should like to ask the Senator from South Carolina a question. Is it the Senator's judgment that if cotton prices would go up 2 or 3 cents a pound higher than they are at the present time, that OPA would hesitate to clamp down the ceiling price which OPA has announced it is its intention to establish?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should not like to answer any question on behalf of OPA. I will only say that I join the Senator from Mississippi and all other Senators who believe in good government in an endeavor to stop any such proceeding, because the different grades of cotton vary in price more than 2 or 3 cents a pound, as the Senator knows, and the Senator also knows that individuals are not going to agree on the matter of differences in grades of cotton.

Mr. EASTLAND. From what I know of the situation, Mr. President, it is my judgment that the OPA is absolutely certain to place a price ceiling on raw cot-

ton should prices go up 2 or 3 cents a pound, and I say further, Mr. President, that cotton today could justifiably go to 30 cents a pound, for it will take that price to give a decent return to those in this country who produce raw cotton, but 30-cent cotton would not increase the clothing bill which consumers in the United States must pay for cotton textiles today.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, the Senator is correct. A pound of cotton makes 4 yards of goods. Such an increase in the price of raw cotton would not make a difference of 15 cents in the price of a shirt.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, in this connection I shall bring a matter to the attention of the Senate next week. Senators from the West who are interested in livestock, as well as Senators from the South who are interested in cotton should obtain the personnel files of OPA and see the type of men who are administering and controlling the basic American industries. Of the five men who have conducted the negotiations respecting price ceilings on raw cotton, four are from the city of New York. Several were deferred from the armed forces as keymen in the OPA. They are professional bureaucrats. They were clerks in the Government service until they were transferred to OPA. Not a single one has had any experience of any kind, character, or description in the cotton business, in the production, growing, marketing, and manufacturing of this commodity. It is utterly impossible to point to any one single qualification that any of these men have to administer and control this great business.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President—

Mr. EASTLAND. And I venture to assert, Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from South Carolina, as extended, has expired. The Chair calls attention to the fact that it is now the morning hour.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand, Mr. President, and I ask unanimous consent that I may conclude my statement.

Mr. EASTLAND. Just a moment. I desire but half a minute to conclude.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Mississippi for one-half minute?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield for one-half minute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Other Senators are on their feet wishing recognition. In view of the fact that we are now in the morning hour other Senators are entitled to recognition.

Mr. EASTLAND. I venture to assert, Mr. President, that if the Senators who are interested in livestock or wheat or other commodities should check the qualifications of the men who are administering those commodities they will be presented with the same miserable picture in the OPA that is presented to the cotton growers. Mr. President, that is why this agency should be abolished and its power should be transferred to permanent Government agencies. I do not think we need any price ceilings on farm products.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. EASTLAND. The powers of the OPA should be transferred to the Department of Agriculture and other permanent Government agencies.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The regular order is demanded. The presentation of further petitions and memorials is in order. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is recognized.

B'NAI B'RITH—CITATION FOR SERVICE BY THE NAVY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, because of the fact that certain fine war work which was begun by a service organization while I was Governor of Massachusetts, later assumed national proportions, I should like to place in the Record the award to that service organization, the B'nai B'rith, by the Navy.

On December 12, 1945, in Boston, the United States Navy presented to B'nai B'rith, the Nation's oldest and largest national Jewish service organization, a special citation for service to the Nation in the war effort. Rear Adm. Forrest P. Sherman, a native son of Massachusetts, and deputy chief of naval operations as the official representative of the Navy, presented a certificate of achievement to Henry Monsky, president of B'nai B'rith. The text of the citation reads: "Certificate of achievement—awarded to B'nai B'rith—in recognition of exceptional accomplishment in behalf of the United States Navy and meritorious contribution to the national war effort."

In presenting the citation, Admiral Sherman said:

The Navy owes a debt of gratitude to the B'nai B'rith and is deeply appreciative of the unselfish service which it has rendered in this war. Particularly noteworthy has been the serve-a-ship program which was originated in Boston by Col. Elliott A. Niles, of B'nai B'rith's National War Service Committee and national chairman of its serve-a-ship program. The program was first inaugurated on the U. S. S. *Massachusetts*.

Starting with the battleship *Massachusetts* in the spring of 1942, through your program more than 800 ships, ranging from battleships and aircraft carriers to destroyers, submarines and landing craft, have been provided with innumerable items which made life at sea less rigorous, and which, by improving conditions of our men, made them better fighting men. Such things as mechanical cows, magazine and newspaper subscriptions, musical instruments, games and radios add up to a very large factor in combat morale. Naval hospitals have been given pianos and a dozen Navy hospital ships have been provided with such needed recreational services and equipment.

In accepting the citation on behalf of B'nai B'rith, Mr. Monsky paid tribute to the work of Colonel Niles and of B'nai B'rith in Boston in initiating the serve-a-ship program. After reviewing the record of B'nai B'rith service to the Navy and expressing his profound appreciation of this gracious recognition by the Navy, Mr. Monsky said the army of B'nai B'rith men, women, and young people who compiled this record "did it

without any expectation of reward, except the gratification that comes from having exercised a patriotic privilege. We are therefore grateful not so much for the citation as for the opportunity which the United States Navy afforded us to mobilize the manpower and womanpower of the B'nai B'rith, to serve the men and women who gave so much and made such great sacrifices in order that our democratic traditions and all which that implies, might be preserved and perpetuated."

Mr. President, I should like to add to that statement for the Record a slightly longer story of the service of the B'nai B'rith to the Navy.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

B'NAI B'RITH SERVES THE NAVY

A sailor and a marine were the first two servicemen who registered on Christmas Eve 1943 at the opening of the B'nai B'rith hospitality house in Los Angeles, the world's largest free hotel for servicemen, which has provided week-end sleeping accommodations, linen, coffee and doughnuts, and homelike surroundings for nearly 150,000 men.

"I don't know this guy 'Benny B'rith,' but if he's the guy who gave me this, you can thank him for me," drawled the battle-scarred marine. And a homesick sailor from Kansas exclaimed, wide-eyed, "You mean all this is free? It doesn't cost a cent? Geez! You guys are O. K."

Throughout the world men and officers of the Navy who have seen and heard what the B'nai B'rith, the Nation's oldest and largest Jewish service organization, has been doing for the men and women of the Navy since long before Pearl Harbor on a completely nonsectarian basis echo the words of that Kansas sailor: "You guys are O. K."

B'nai B'rith's service to the Navy long antedated Pearl Harbor. In the fall of 1940 B'nai B'rith began providing recreational equipment for the use of officers and crews of submarines, destroyer escorts, PT boats, and similar vessels, and for the officers and men of Marine Corps units. The most popular piece of equipment was an indoor football game which was distributed by the thousands to naval district recreational officers and commandants of Marine Corps barracks. Because of their compact form and the ease with which they could be used in the most crowded quarters, ships' officers and Marine Corps officers flooded B'nai B'rith for repeat orders.

Two other B'nai B'rith projects that began months before Pearl Harbor also included service to the Navy. Of the 1,520 recreation facilities furnished and equipped for the armed forces in every State by B'nai B'rith, 294 were outfitted at naval shore stations, training schools, naval and Coast Guard hospitals, Marine Corps bases, Navy airfields, and WAVE and SPAR barracks and schools at a cost of more than \$225,000. These ranged from complete recreation buildings furnished at McIntyre Hospital, Great Lakes Naval Training Station, to recreation, reading, game, and sun rooms. Of the 200 Torah scrolls, furnished by B'nai B'rith for use in conducting Jewish religious services, 43 were provided for Navy chapels.

The biggest B'nai B'rith war-service program for the Navy is the serve-a-ship project, through which B'nai B'rith units adopted more than 800 naval vessels, ranging from battleships and giant carriers to the smallest landing craft. Starting with the U. S. S. *Massachusetts* in the spring of 1942, B'nai B'rith has outfitted fighting ships with such things as mechanical cows, musical instruments for ships' bands and orchestras, magazine and newspaper subscriptions, libraries,

games by the thousands, radios, phonographs and record libraries, playing cards, recording machines, washing machines, soda fountains, religious equipment, portable organs, sound systems, game kits, tonsorial equipment, electric irons, cameras and film, cigarette lighters.

Mechanical cows, which furnish fresh milk and ice cream at all times, were given to the U. S. S. *Boston* and the aircraft carrier *Lexington* at a cost of \$5,000. The battleships *Massachusetts*, *Iowa*, *Wisconsin*, *Missouri* were provided with complete equipment to outfit a ship's orchestra, in addition to recording equipment, hundreds of game kits, an endless supply of magazine subscriptions, and playing cards. Scores of destroyers and destroyer escorts launched at Atlantic, Gulf, New England, and Pacific coast bases were given specially built radio receivers.

Early in 1944 the Navy's Amphibious Forces called upon B'nai B'rith to extend its services to the officers and crews of LCI, LTI, and LSM boats. Since then more than 400 of such vessels have been adopted by B'nai B'rith, which provided the officers and men with regular supplies of tobacco, candy, cigarettes, books, and games. In a number of instances these ships were outfitted with complete sound systems. Every submarine launched at the Portsmouth Naval Base was provided with a case of recreation equipment by B'nai B'rith. At the Evansville, Ind., yard every Navy ship launched went to sea flying an American flag presented by B'nai B'rith.

Over 300 portable organs for religious and recreational use by Navy and marine units throughout the world were made available by B'nai B'rith. Even such things as dutch ovens and electric irons, which were treasures to men aboard Coast Guard vessels, were furnished by B'nai B'rith. The naval gun crews on merchant marine ships were not forgotten either. Regular gift packages were provided for these men as well as chests of athletic equipment. Special shopping services were arranged for the men while on shore leave.

The serve-a-ship program was extended to Navy hospital ships in the summer of 1944, with the approval of the Surgeon General of the Navy. The first organization to undertake such service, B'nai B'rith provided special gift packages for wounded seamen en route home and added a homey touch by making available individually wrapped birthday gifts. Since the middle of 1945 this hospital ship program has been converted into a similar service for the men at Navy hospitals.

No service has been too large or too small. When the Navy Chaplains' Office found a need for supplementary ritual equipment for Jewish naval chaplains, B'nai B'rith stepped in and made it available. A 48-page brochure entitled "Ministering to Jews in the Navy," issued by the Navy Chaplains' Office, was published with the aid of a B'nai B'rith grant.

During Navy Day, B'nai B'rith helped feed and entertain thousands of bluejackets in New York, Los Angeles, and San Francisco. Countless Navy men and officers have been entertained at every manner of B'nai B'rith hospitality program.

In all these services to the Navy, B'nai B'rith was motivated by its century-old tradition of service to the Nation. But it got a big thrill about the battle exploits of the ships whose men it adopted. The high mark came when the U. S. S. *Missouri*, which had been equipped with recreation material by B'nai B'rith, was selected as the site of the Japanese surrender. When the newsreels showed an LCI boat adopted by B'nai B'rith leading the invasion of southern France, the B'nai B'rith celebrated by speeding up its recreation program for landing craft. When

the U. S. S. *Massachusetts* took part in the invasion of north Africa, B'nai B'rith got a big thrill out of a gift of a piece of shell fired at Oran which the crew sent to B'nai B'rith, and the first American flag to be planted in the Palau Islands was one presented to a landing craft by B'nai B'rith.

Among B'nai B'rith's most prized possessions are the stacks of letters it has received from officers and men in all parts of the world, telling how the recreation material furnished by B'nai B'rith contributed toward the high morale of the Navy's fighting men. These letters came from Admiral Nimitz, Surgeon General McIntire, former Chief of Chaplains Workman, Admiral Denfield, and scores of officers, chaplains, and enlisted men.

No complete list of all the ships served by B'nai B'rith is available because during the war reasons of security made it impossible for ship's names to be disclosed in many cases. Thus, B'nai B'rith equipment and gifts were assigned to literally hundreds of ships whose names were not known until letters of appreciation began pouring in, but the following is a partial list of some of the bigger ships:

Battleships: *Massachusetts*, *Missouri*, *Iowa*, *Wisconsin*.

Aircraft carriers: *Franklin D. Roosevelt*, *Wasp*, *Lexington*, *Bunker Hill*, *Shangri-La*.

Cruisers: *Baltimore*, *Stamford*, *Boston*, *Biloxi*, *Long Beach*, *St. Paul*, *Philadelphia*, *Providence*, *Houston*, *Albany*, *Astoria*, *Pasadena*, *Chicago*, *Cincinnati*.

Destroyers and destroyer escorts: *Ward*, *O'Brien*, *Leland Thomas*, *Strauss*, *Miller*, *Stewart*, *Keith*, *Moore*, *Tomich*, *Sturtevant*, *Otterstetter*, *Mayrant*, *Mason*, *Lipan*, *Cabana*, *Jeffery*, *Farquhar*, *Stadtfeld*, *Mifflin*, *Gwinnet*, *Richland*, *Lebanon*, *Rockland*, *Dawson*, *Norton Sound*, *Deule*, *Chilton*, *Telfair*, *Admiral Sims*, *Powell*, *Robert I. Paine*, *Reuben James*, *Sloat*, *Firedrake*, *Alexander J. Luke*.

CHRISTIAN PEACE IN A CHRISTIAN EUROPE—PETITIONS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference petitions from sundry citizens of the United States, praying for a Christian peace in a Christian Europe and a curb on rampant tyranny. I ask unanimous consent that one of the petitions be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The petitions presented by the Senator from Ohio will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and without objection, one of the petitions will be printed in the RECORD.

The petition is as follows:

As an American citizen, entitled to vote, I hereby sign your "Petition to Congress for a Christian peace in a Christian Europe and a curb on rampant tyranny, a peace not of fears but of charity, of hope and not of desolation, a peace without rancor or falsehood, and fit for men born free and equal in pursuit of happiness."

REV. ANTHONY G. ANDRES.

DAYTON, OHIO.

COMPULSORY MILITARY SERVICE—EDITORIAL FROM LABOR

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, Labor, a well-known publication which is devoted to the interests of labor, has printed an editorial expressing its opposition to compulsory military service in peacetime, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINISTERS CONDEMN COMPULSORY SERVICE

Despite newspaper polls the people of this country are emphatically opposed to compulsory military training in peacetime. A splendid illustration of this was given in Washington within the last few days.

The Washington Ministerial Union is made up of practically all the pastors of Protestant churches in the Capital. At the last meeting of the union, Rev. Custer Cromwell, pastor of Lewis Memorial Methodist Church, offered a resolution condemning "enactment of any law by Congress which would provide for universal compulsory military training for the youth of our Nation." It was adopted almost unanimously.

A week or so before, Catholic bishops from all parts of the country met in Washington for their regular meeting and they, too, condemned the President's plan for compulsory service.

These are just "straws," but they are impressive "straws." Ministers of the gospel are not so far removed from members of their congregations as to radically differ with them on such an outstanding issue.

RELEASE OF FARM MACHINERY FOR RECLAMATION AND CONSERVATION—RESOLUTION OF MISSISSIPPI STATE ASSOCIATION OF SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT COMMISSIONERS

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Mississippi State Association of Soil Conservation District Commissioners at its annual meeting in Jackson, Miss., on January 5, 1946, favoring release of farm machinery for reclamation and conservation of soil of Mississippi.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Whereas Mississippi is and has always been primarily an agricultural State;

"Whereas soil depletion and waste of soil resources due to heavy rainfall and improper land use have possibly exceeded that of any other State in the Nation;

"Whereas the State of Mississippi, through the agency of the Soil Conservation Service, now has information and plans suitable for the reclamation and conservation of the soils and natural resources of said State;

"Whereas due to the present impoverished condition of the soils of the State the majority of the individual farmers are unable financially to purchase and operate machinery capable of reclaiming and saving the soil and natural resources of the State;

"Whereas there is held by the Federal Government at this time vast stores of surplus war materials;

"Whereas the farmers of the State of Mississippi are but temporary custodians of the birthright of the State, namely, its soil and natural resources; and

"Whereas it would be to the benefit of the Nation as a whole and to generations yet unborn to reclaim and preserve this natural heritage: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Soil Conservation District Commissioners of the State of Mississippi at their annual meeting in Jackson, Miss., on January 5, 1946, That the United States Government be requested to deliver, through its proper agency, without charge, to the Soil Conservation Service for grant to soil-conservation districts such machinery as the

State Association of Soil Conservation District Commissioners in its opinion deems necessary for the proper reclamation and conservation of the soils of Mississippi; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President and Acting Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from the State of Mississippi."

I certify that the above is a true and correct copy of a resolution unanimously passed by the Mississippi State Association of Soil Conservation District Commissioners at its annual meeting in Jackson, Miss., on January 3, 1946.

PAUL D. MERRELL,
State President of the Association.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1613. A bill for the relief of Christopher Dance; with an amendment (Rept. No. 890).

JANUARY 2, 1946.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the

By Mr. McMAHON, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 884. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the Patuxent Development Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 891).

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate reports for the month of December 1945, from the chairmen of certain committees, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC
LANDS AND SURVEYS,
January 2, 1946.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the

SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

name of a person employed by the committee who is not a full-time employee of the Senate or of the committee for the month of December 1945, in compliance with the terms

name of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of December 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944 (see attached memorandum):

CARL A. HATCH, Chairman.
By W. H. McMains, Clerk.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC
LANDS AND SURVEYS,
January 2, 1946.

Memorandum to Senator CARL A. HATCH, chairman, Senate Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

From Senator PAT McCARRAN, chairman, Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration and Use of Public Lands.

The following persons are detailed from the Department of Agriculture (Forest Service) to assist with the work of the above-mentioned subcommittee:

E. S. Haskell, senior administrative officer, Forest Service, CAF-12; basic salary, \$5,000 per annum.

Elizabeth Heckman, clerk, CAF-5; basic salary, \$2,000 per annum.

of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to Aug. 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Mrs. Mamie L. Mizen	1434 Saratoga Ave.	District of Columbia government	\$3,970

KENNETH McKELLAR, Acting Chairman.

* COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

DECEMBER 31, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the

names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of December 1945, in compliance with the terms

of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to Aug. 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Capt. James A. Saunders, USN (retired).	4105 Oliver St., Chevy Chase, Md.	Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	\$6,000
Chief Yeoman Herbert S. Atkinson (T), USNR.	2405 Pennington Rd., Trenton, N. J.	do	1,739
Yeoman First Class John M. Flannery, USNR.	17 Livingston St., Binghamton, N. Y.	do	1,436

DAVID I. WALSH, Chairman.

SENATE NAVY LIAISON OFFICE, ROOM 461, SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

DECEMBER 31, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the

names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of December 1945, in compliance with the terms

of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Lt. Comdr. Frederick A. McLaughlin, USNR.	317 Lynn Drive, Chevy Chase, Md.	Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	\$3,000
Lt. Comdr. Joseph G. Feeney, USNR.	2745 29th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	do	3,150
Lt. Comdr. H. Harris, USNR.	1835 Phelps Pl. NW., Washington, D. C.	do	3,150
Loretto F. Jochman, yeoman second class, USNR.	3445 Oakwood Ter. NW., Washington, D. C.	do	1,152
Eleanor W. St. Clair, yeoman second class, USNR.	do	do	1,152
C. Wilson, seaman first class, USNR.	Wave Quarters D, Washington, D. C.	do	742

The above employees are representatives of the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, to assist Senators on naval personnel matters.

DAVID I. WALSH.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

JANUARY 2, 1946.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the

name of a person employed by the committee who is not a full-time employee of the Senate or of the committee for the month of December 1945, in compliance with the terms

of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to Aug. 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
John W. Nelson	2745 29th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.	\$5,600

JAMES E. MURRAY, *Chairman.*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WARTIME HEALTH AND EDUCATION

JANUARY 1, 1946.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the

names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of December 1945, in compliance with the terms

of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to Aug. 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Lauretta April	2714 Quarry Rd. NW., Washington, D. C.	National Housing Agency, 1001 Vermont Ave. NW.	\$4,300
Charles Bragman	Arlington Village Apartments, Arlington, Va.	Federal Public Housing Authority, 1201 Connecticut Ave. NW.	6,440
Betty Brimberg	5331 16th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Farm Security Administration, U. S. Department of Agriculture	2,100
Olive F. Calbeck	237 Mississippi Ave. SE., Washington, D. C.	Federal Public Housing Authority, 1201 Connecticut Ave. NW.	2,320
Gross Conklin	514 2d St. NW., Washington, D. C.	U. S. Public Health Service	6,230
Phillip C. Curtis	4303 Russell Ave., Mount Rainier, Md.	Navy Department, 18th and Constitution Ave. NW.	4,600
Patricia Daines	2000 F St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Department of Labor, 14th and Constitution Ave. NW.	2,100
Richard P. Daniels	1743 Columbia Rd. NW., Washington, D. C.	Federal Public Housing Authority, 1201 Connecticut Ave. NW.	1,704
Marion L. Dillon	3659 Minnesota Ave. SE., Washington, D. C.	Navy Department, 18th and Constitution	3,200
Rose Gerber	2513 14th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Veterans' Administration, Vermont and I St. NW.	3,047
Bernard Leroy	Persimmon Tree Rd., Bethesda, Md.	Navy Department, 18th and Constitution Ave. NW.	7,500
Joseph McMurray	120 C St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Department of Labor, 14th and Constitution Ave. NW.	5,180
Love Morgan	1607 18th St. SE., Washington, D. C.	Veterans' Administration, Vermont and I St. NW.	2,650
Dolores Raschella	3028 Wisconsin Ave. NW., Washington, D. C.	Federal Public Housing, 1201 Connecticut Ave.	2,320
Milton Rossoff	2712 29th St. SE., Washington, D. C.	Office of Labor, Department of Agriculture	4,500
Lt. Comdr. John B. Truslow, M. C., USNR.	2007 Peabody St., West Hyattsville, Md.	Navy Department, 18th and Constitution Ave. NW.	3,000
Capt. Leslie Falk, M. C., AUS.	2804 Terrace Rd. SE., Washington, D. C.	War Department, Pentagon Building	2,000

CLAUDE PEPPER, *Chairman.*

SENATE MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON WAR MOBILIZATION

JANUARY 5, 1946.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the

names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of December 1945, in compliance with the terms

of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to Aug. 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Ann S. Gertler	3721 39th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.	\$2,980.00
Joan P. Karasik	1919 19th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Foreign Economic Administration, Washington, D. C.	4,300.00
C. Theodore Larson	3917 North 5th St., Arlington, Va.	National Housing Agency, Washington, D. C.	6,230.00
Fritzie P. Manuel	1621 T St. NW., Washington, D. C.	State Department, Washington, D. C.	5,180.00
Darel McConkey	509 Fontaine St., Alexandria, Va.	Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.	6,230.00
Cora L. Moen	5327 16th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.	2,650.00
Elizabeth H. Oleksy	1620 Fuller St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, Washington, D. C.	3,090.00
Mary Jane Oliveto	500 B St. NE., Washington, D. C.	National Housing Agency, Washington, D. C.	2,100.00
Francis C. Rosenberger	5814 64th Ave., East Riverdale, Md.	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.	6,230.00
Herbert Schimmel	3604 Minnesota Ave. SE., Washington, D. C.	Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, Washington, D. C.	9,012.50

H. M. KILGORE, *Chairman.*

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

JANUARY 1, 1946.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the

names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of December 1945, in compliance with the terms

of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Herman Edelsberg	2141 Suitland Ter. SE., Washington, D. C.	Foreign Economic Administration, Washington, D. C.	\$7,175
Harry J. Evans	3010 Gainsville St. SE., Washington, D. C.	Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C.	7,175
F. Preston Forbes	502 Four Mile Rd., Alexandria, Va.	Commerce Department, Washington, D. C.	7,175
Scott K. Gray	119 Joliet St. SW., Washington, D. C.	Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C.	5,390
Stella J. Groeper	1127 Branch Ave. SE., Washington, D. C.	do	2,980
Lt. George H. Soule	4020 Beecher St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	2,400
L. Evelyn Spicer	1708 Kilbourne Pl. NW., Washington, D. C.	Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C.	3,090
Frederick W. Steckman	4000 Cathedral Ave. NW., Washington, D. C.	Maritime Commission, Washington, D. C.	5,600
Margie L. Strubel	4632 12th St. NE., Washington, D. C.	Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C.	2,320
Allen G. Thurman	9729 Bexhill Dr., Rock Creek Hills, Md.	Maritime Commission, Washington, D. C.	7,175

JAMES E. MURRAY, *Chairman.*

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

DECEMBER 31, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the

names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of December 1945, in compliance with the terms

of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to Aug. 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Edward U. Condon	3324 Military Rd.	Bureau of Standards	\$9,800.00
James R. Newman	1321 Holly St. NW	Office of War Mobilization	9,012.50
Jean Sulzberger	1457 Belmont St. NW	National Institute of Public Affairs	(¹)

¹ Miss Sulzberger is employed without compensation under title of intern, a student studying committee procedure.

BRIEN McMAHON, Chairman.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 1731. A bill for the relief of Lester A. Dessez; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 1732. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward H. Isenhardt; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 1733. A bill for the relief of Desmark Wright; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. WILSON introduced Senate bill 1734, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1735. A bill to authorize the promotion of certain officers who were wounded while performing duties of a higher grade; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1736. A bill to provide financing for rehabilitation of precious metal mines; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

(Mr. McCARRAN also introduced Senate bill 1737, to incorporate into the Judicial Code the provisions of certain statutes relating to three-judge district courts, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1738. A bill to establish a Chief of Chaplains in the United States Navy;

S. 1739. A bill to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires which occurred at various Navy shore activities; and

S. 1740. A bill to provide for payment of travel allowances and transportation, and for transportation of dependents and shipment of household effects, of members of the naval forces upon separation from active service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 1741. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yoneko Nakazawa; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 1742. A bill for the relief of Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

S. 1743. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act defining the compensation of persons holding positions as deputy clerks and commissioners of United States district courts, and for other purposes," approved June 16, 1938;

S. 1744. A bill to permit retired officers of the armed forces to act as an agent or attorney for prosecuting a claim against the United States; and

S. 1745. A bill to change Armistice Day to World Peace Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 1746. A bill to govern distribution of war trophies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1747. A bill for the relief of John C. Spargo; and

S. 1748. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Ivor E. Nicholas; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for Mr. CARVILLE) introduced Senate bill 1749, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 1750. A bill for the relief of Dan C. Rodgers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1751. A bill for the relief of Wayne Parker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1752. A bill to increase the insurance protection of depositors in federally insured banks from \$5,000 to \$15,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1753. A bill to increase the rates of pensions payable to widows of veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 1754. A bill to provide for allowance of premiums paid on not to exceed \$5,000 of life insurance as a credit against Federal income tax; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. J. Res. 130. Joint resolution to authorize the President to appoint Rear Adm. Earle W. Mills, United States Navy, to the office of Chairman and member of the United States Maritime Commission and Administrator of the War Shipping Administration without affecting his naval status and perquisites; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. J. Res. 131. Joint resolution clarifying the Surplus Property Act in regard to sale of defense housing for veterans; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILL:

S. J. Res. 132. Joint resolution clarifying the Surplus Property Act in regard to sale of defense housing for veterans; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

RELEASE OF CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS FROM THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to require the release of certain individuals from the armed forces, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1734) to require the release of certain

individuals from the armed forces, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That after the date of the enactment of this act, no member of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, other than a commissioned officer or a warrant officer in the regular component of either of such services, may be required involuntarily to remain on active duty in the armed forces of the United States subsequent to the expiration of 6 months after October 1, 1945, unless he (1) is then serving under an enlistment in the regular component of his service which has not expired, (2) is a selectee who has not completed 1 year of training and service for which he is liable under the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, or (3) is serving a sentence imposed by a court martial or is under charges of having violated the Articles of War or the Articles for the Government of the Navy.

PROCEDURE FOR CONVENING THREE- JUDGE DISTRICT COURTS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I send forward for appropriate reference a bill to incorporate into the Judicial Code the provisions of certain statutes relating to three-judge district courts, and for other purposes.

In connection with the bill, I send forward, by way of explanation of the bill, a letter from Mr. Henry P. Chandler, Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, and a statement of Messrs. Albert B. Maris, Kimbrough Stone, and Orle L. Phillips on behalf of the special committee of the Conference of Senior Circuit Judges.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill introduced by the Senator from Nevada will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1737) to incorporate into the Judicial Code the provisions of certain statutes relating to three-judge district courts, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The letter and statement ordered to be printed in the RECORD are as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS,

Washington, D. C., December 27, 1945.

HON. PAT McCARRAN,
Chairman, Judiciary Committee,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR McCARRAN: I herewith transmit a bill recommended by the Judicial Conference of Senior Circuit Judges to regulate the procedure for convening district courts

of three judges provided for by statute, and respectfully request its introduction and consideration. The purpose is to establish a uniform method in place of the differing methods now prescribed by different statutes.

There are four statutes which at present authorize the convening of a district court of three judges and prescribe the procedure to be followed: (1) the Expediting Act (15 U. S. C., Supp. IV, 28, and 49 id. 44), which relates to suits brought by the Government under the antitrust and commerce laws; (2) section 266 of the Judicial Code (28 U. S. C. 380), which relates to suits brought to restrain the enforcement of State statutes; (3) the act of August 24, 1937 (28 U. S. C. 380a), which relates to suits brought to restrain the enforcement of Federal statutes; and (4) the Urgent Deficiencies Act (28 U. S. C. 47), which relates to suits brought to set aside orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Each of the statutes cited prescribes that the three-judge district court shall include at least one circuit judge (or in the case of section 266 of the Judicial Code, a Justice of the Supreme Court). The choice of the judges to be designated is vested by the statutes Nos. 1 and 3 above in the senior circuit judge of the circuit; the choice under the statutes Nos. 2 and 4 rests in the judge before whom the case is first brought, who calls to his assistance two other judges. The former method is provided for by the act of 1937 (56 Stat. 753, 28 U. S. C. 380a) and by the last amendment of the Expediting Act (56 Stat. 198, 15 U. S. C., Supp. IV, 28, and 49 id. 44). These enactments represent the latest expression of the Congress on the subject and the method prescribed seems to the Judicial Conference logical and desirable. Consequently, it is adopted in the enclosed bill as the method to be followed in all cases in which a three-judge district court is necessary.

In addition to providing for a uniform method of constituting three-judge district courts, the enclosed bill reenacts with some rearrangement and slight changes of language for the sake of clarity and order, various provisions of the Judicial Code and the Urgent Deficiencies Act relating to proceedings of the nature involved. The need for such a revision and the nature of it are explained in a report of a committee of the Judicial Conference, consisting of Circuit Judges Kimbrough Stone, of Missouri, Orle L. Phillips, of Colorado, Albert B. Maris, of Pennsylvania, and Evan A. Evans, of Wisconsin, dated October 3, 1944, and annotations on the bill in the form recommended at that time, copies of both of which are attached. (The subsequent changes in the bill in the course of its consideration by the Judicial Conference did not affect its general nature and result, so that the report and annotations with a few minor exceptions relating to section 207 and the last two sentences of section 209 of the Judicial Code as shown in section 2 of the annotated bill (the former of which is altered and the latter of which are omitted in the enclosed bill) are still applicable.)

The measure now recommended is necessary in order to render the method of constituting three-judge district courts required by statute, certain and uniform. It will simplify and improve the part of the Judicial Code affected, and I trust that it may meet the approval of the Congress and be enacted.

Respectfully yours,

HENRY P. CHANDLER.

To the Chief Justice of the United States and Members of the Conference of Senior Circuit Judges:

Pursuant to the direction of the conference at its September session, 1942, the committee which was continued to draft a bill to provide a uniform method of assembling specially constituted district courts of three judges, submits as its report the draft bill

annexed hereto as appendix A. Also annexed, marked "Appendix B," are explanatory notes as to each section of the draft bill. Some additional explanation of the plan upon which the bill was drafted and of the changes which it would effect, may be helpful.

There are four statutes which at present authorize the convening of a district court of three judges and provide in detail the procedure in respect thereto, (1) the Expediting Act (15 U. S. C. A. 28 and 49 U. S. C. A. 44) which relates to suits brought by the Government under the antitrust and commerce laws, (2) section 266 of the Judicial Code (28 U. S. C. A. 380) which relates to suits brought to restrain the enforcement of State statutes, (3) the act of August 24, 1937 (28 U. S. C. A. 380a) which relates to suits brought to restrain the enforcement of Federal statutes, and (4) the Urgent Deficiencies Act (28 U. S. C. A. 47) which relates to suits brought to set aside orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Prior to the passage of the act of April 6, 1942, there was no uniformity in the provisions of these statutes with regard to the convening of such courts and the procedure therein. The Expediting Act provided that the court should be made up of not less than three circuit judges but was silent as to the manner in which the circuit judges who were to sit in the case should be selected. Section 266 of the Judicial Code and the Urgent Deficiencies Act both provide that the court shall be constituted by the judge to whom the application is made calling to his assistance two other judges. Neither act, however, makes it the duty of the judges thus summoned to attend.

The act of 1937, on the other hand, sets forth a definite method of convening a three-judge district court by application to the senior circuit judge who thereupon designates the judges who are to sit in the court. The act provides that it shall be the duty of the judges so designated to participate in the case. It provides that the three-judge procedure shall apply to the grant of both interlocutory and permanent injunctions. It sets forth the procedure for granting a temporary restraining order and provides for a direct appeal to the Supreme Court. The act of 1937 is the last as well as the most carefully drawn expression by Congress on the subject. It conforms to the procedure approved by the judicial conference last year. Your committee accordingly has taken the provisions of the act of 1937 as the basis for our draft of uniform provisions in all three-judge cases.

In line with this idea Congress last year passed the act of April 6, 1942 (56 Stat. 198), which amended the Expediting Act so as to provide substantially the same method of constituting a three-judge expediting court for Government suits under the antitrust and commerce laws as is provided by the act of 1937. Your committee accordingly proposes by the draft bill herewith submitted to amend the statutory provisions for the review of Interstate Commerce Commission orders (now contained in the Urgent Deficiencies Act) and section 266 of the Judicial Code relating to suits to enjoin State statutes, so as to make them uniform, insofar as they relate to three-judge district courts, with the provisions contained in the act of 1937.

In preparing a draft act for this purpose we were strongly impressed by the unsatisfactory condition of the present statutory provisions for the enforcement and review of orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Jurisdiction to enforce, enjoin or suspend orders of the Commission was, by the act of June 18, 1910, taken from the circuit courts and conferred upon the Commerce Court which that act created. The provisions of the act of 1910 relating to the Commerce Court were continued in the Judicial Code of 1911 as sections 200 to 214, inclusive.

When in 1913 Congress decided to abolish the Commerce Court and to transfer its jurisdiction to the district courts with the proviso that suits to enjoin, or suspend orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission should be heard by three judges, it did so by inserting provisions to that effect in the Urgent Deficiencies Appropriation Act of that year. However, Congress did not include complete provisions in the Urgent Deficiencies Act but referred as to some of the procedure to the law regulating the Commerce Court which is to be found in sections 207 to 212 of the Judicial Code.

Thus instead of expressly repealing these sections of the Judicial Code the Urgent Deficiencies Act impliedly repealed them in part and in part impliedly amended and retained them. Consequently we must look both to the Urgent Deficiencies Act and to certain portions of sections 207 to 212 of the Judicial Code for the law upon the subject of the enforcement and review of Interstate Commerce Commission orders. Just to what extent the provisions of these sections of the Judicial Code are still in force is a matter of no little difficulty and doubt, however, as is well illustrated by the differing results which the compilers of the United States Code reached in codifying these provisions in the original codification in 1925 and in the 1934 edition of the code. See, for example, sections 45a and 47a of title 28 of the code, 1934 edition, which include portions of sections 210, 212, and 213 of the Judicial Code which were omitted from the original compilation of the code. Compare also section 41 (27), 44 and 45 as they appear in the original and in the 1934 edition of the code. Furthermore there is a patent ambiguity in the venue provisions of the Urgent Deficiencies Act (28 U. S. C. A. 43) to which attention was called in the Senate at the time the conference report on the Urgent Deficiencies Act was considered, but which it was then stated could not be corrected at that late legislative stage.

In the light of this confused statutory situation your committee believed it to be timely and useful to expand the draft bill to the extent necessary to incorporate into the appropriate sections of the Judicial Code all of the statutory provisions upon this subject which are now in force, thus putting all the law into one place—and that the logical and proper place—and eliminating entirely any necessity for reference to the Urgent Deficiencies Act, which has always been an illogical and, because of its lack of section numbers, a difficult statute in which to find the law upon this subject. This task was made easier by reason of the work of the compilers of the United States Code who in the 1934 edition made a careful effort to fit all existing provisions both of the Urgent Deficiencies Act and of sections 207 to 212 of the Judicial Code into their appropriate places in the codification. Since the United States Code does not have the force of law, however, it is necessary in our draft bill to reenact all of these codified provisions so that they may have the force of law. This must be done in the case of each section in which the provisions of the Urgent Deficiencies Act and of the Judicial Code have been blended together even though, as is true in a number of instances, our committee has no change of substance to suggest.

The sections of the draft act which enact without changes of substance the provisions of the existing law as they have been codified in the United States Code, 1934 edition, are section 1, which enacts into section 24 of the Judicial Code the provisions of subdivisions 8, 27, and 28 as codified in 28 United States Code, 1934 edition, section 41, subdivisions 8, 27, and 28, and section 2, insofar as it enacts sections 210, 211, and 212 of the Judicial Code as they have been codified and appear in 28 United States Code, 1934 edition, sections 47a, 48, and 45a, respectively.

Section 2 of the draft bill also proposes to amend sections 207, 208, and 209 of the Judicial Code. It proposes to incorporate into section 207 the venue provisions of the Urgent Deficiencies Act (28 U. S. C. 43) modified so as to remove the ambiguities which appear in the original language and so as to save from implied repeal those venue provisions which have been included in more recently enacted sections of the Interstate Commerce Act. The venue provisions of the Urgent Deficiencies Act were evidently prepared very hurriedly in conference between the Senate and House of Representatives, and they contain some language which is ambiguous and other provisions which are wholly meaningless. It would unduly extend this report to discuss these provisions in detail. It may, therefore, be sufficient to point out that these ambiguities were pointed out in the Senate by Senators Sutherland and Poindexter and discussed by Senators Martin, Borah, and Walsh. (See 50 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pt. 3, pp. 5617-5619.) The debate was closed with the following statement by Senator Sutherland:

"Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, it may be that the courts will come to relieve this situation and straighten out this matter. As has been said by the chairman of the committee, the matter has passed the point where this body can do anything about it, but I cannot let the matter be finally disposed of without saying that it is a piece of exceedingly loose legislation. It is so unhappily worded and there is so much confusion in it that a responsible legislative body like the Senate of the United States ought to be ashamed to let it go upon the statute books."

These provisions have been carefully studied by our committee in conference with the general counsel for the Interstate Commerce Commission and the provisions which are incorporated in the draft bill as section 207 of the Judicial Code represent our joint judgment as to the language which will appropriately cover all the cases which are likely to arise.

Section 208 of the Judicial Code is proposed to be amended by section 2 of the draft bill by incorporating therein the provisions of the Urgent Deficiencies Act for the restraint or suspension of orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission by three-judge district courts modified so as to make the provisions thereof uniform with those of the act of 1937. The section as proposed to be amended thus provides that judges who are to sit in the three-judge district court shall be designated by the senior circuit judge upon request of the judge to whom the application is made and that it shall be the duty of the judges designated by the senior circuit judge to participate in the hearing and determination of the case. It is likewise provided that the single judge to whom the application is made *m. v.*, after hearing, grant a temporary restraining order to remain in force only until hearing and determination of the application for an interlocutory injunction by the three judges. This will make it unnecessary to convene the three-judge court immediately to consider applications for temporary restraining orders pending hearing of the application for an interlocutory injunction. Our committee is advised by the general counsel for the Interstate Commerce Commission that this particular change in the procedure will be satisfactory and that the customary practice has been for the Commission itself to suspend the operation of its orders for a temporary period in order to make it unnecessary for the three judges to convene immediately. It would seem that there is no more reason to require a court of three judges to pass upon the grant of a temporary restraining order pending preliminary hearing in an Interstate Commerce Commission case than in a suit to restrain the operation of a Federal or State statute. In the latter cases it has always been the rule that a single judge

may grant a temporary restraining order for a limited time pending hearing by the three judges.

Section 209 of the Judicial Code as proposed to be amended by section 2 of the draft bill is substantially in the form in which the provisions of that section and certain provisions of the Urgent Deficiencies Act are codified in sections 44 and 45 of title 28 of the United States Code, 1934 edition. The only change of substance proposed by our committee is to make the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure applicable to cases relating to Interstate Commerce Commission orders instead of the detailed and somewhat obsolete provisions which are now contained in section 209. It is thought probable that the Rules of Civil Procedure have already superseded these provisions by virtue of the act under which the rules were adopted. The existing provision for filing copies of the summons and complaint on the secretary of the Interstate Commerce Commission has, however, been retained at the request of the General Counsel for the Commission. Also at his suggestion it is provided that answers by the United States and other defendants are to be filed in 30 days instead of 60 days and 20 days, respectively, as provided by Civil Procedure Rule 20a.

Section 4 of the draft bill amends section 266 of the Judicial Code which relates to suits brought to enjoin the operation of State statutes. The provisions of the section are modified so as to make them uniform so far as may be with the similar provisions of the act of 1937 relating to the restraint of Federal statutes. Thus it is provided that the judges who are to sit in a three-judge district court under section 266 shall be designated by the senior circuit judge at the request of the judge to whom application for an injunction is made and that it shall be the duty of the judges thus designated to take part. The procedure is also made uniform with that contained in the act of 1937 and the reference in section 266 to Justices of the Supreme Court is eliminated since it represents the inadvertent retention in the Judicial Code of a provision rendered obsolete when the code, by abolishing the old circuit courts, took from the Supreme Court Justices, sitting as circuit justices, their former power to entertain in the circuit courts applications for injunctions and to grant injunctions therein.

Sections 3, 5, 6, and 7 of the draft bill involve necessary technical amendments of related statutes which refer to the Urgent Deficiencies Act. The amendments merely substitute references to the sections of the Judicial Code into which the provisions of the Urgent Deficiencies Act are proposed by the bill to be inserted.

Section 8 proposes to repeal expressly those sections of the Judicial Code relating to the Commerce Court which were impliedly repealed by the Urgent Deficiencies Act and also those portions of the latter act which are incorporated in the Judicial Code by the draft bill.

Your committee is aware that another committee, of which Judge Learned Hand is chairman, has been considering the questions whether the review of orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission by three-judge district courts should be abandoned in favor of review by circuit courts of appeals and whether the right of appeal to the Supreme Court should be eliminated and certiorari substituted. Since that committee is making no recommendation upon these points at this time, we have incorporated no change in respect to them in the draft bill. If the conference should determine upon any such change, it can readily be incorporated in the draft bill before introduction into Congress.

Respectfully submitted.

ALBERT B. MARIS,
KIMBROUGH STONE,
ORIE L. PHILLIPS,
For the Committee.

[Signed as of September 23, 1943.]

SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT BY THE COMMITTEE

Since the presentation of our report and draft bill to the Conference of Senior Circuit Judges 1 year ago the consolidated committee, appointed to draft legislation providing for the review of orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission, working in collaboration with the Commission has given further study to the subject of the venue of review proceedings and has reported proposed statutory provisions upon this subject which we think are improvements upon the venue provisions which section 2 of our draft bill proposed to incorporate into section 207 of the Judicial Code. We have accordingly prepared and have appended to the draft bill an alternative amendment of section 207 which incorporates these revised and improved venue provisions. We have also in the interest of clarity inserted in the draft bill after each section the explanatory note relating to that section which we had previously included in Appendix B to our report. Appendix B is accordingly omitted.

KIMBROUGH STONE,
ORIE L. PHILLIPS,
ALBERT B. MARIS,
EVAN A. EVANS,
For the Committee.

OCTOBER 3, 1944.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE], who is absent on business connected with his office and unable to be present today, I introduce a bill. The bill is to provide for the national defense and security by requiring that all qualified young men perform a period of training and service in the armed forces of the United States.

I desire to say that I am not in favor of this particular bill or any other bill providing for conscription. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement released by the Senator from Nevada, explaining the bill.

The bill (S. 1749) to provide for the national defense and security by requiring that all qualified young men perform a period of training and service in the armed forces of the United States, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado for Mr. CARVILLE, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The statement presented by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado for Mr. CARVILLE was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 14.—Uninterrupted high school and college educations for those desiring them would be guaranteed under a compulsory educational military training bill sponsored in the United States Senate today by Senator E. P. CARVILLE, Democrat, Nevada.

Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Democrat, Colorado, introduced the measure on behalf of Senator CARVILLE who was unable to attend.

Under Senator CARVILLE's measure all youth will be required to serve one full year in the armed services but provisions of the bill are such that no youth who desired an education would be deprived of the opportunity of uninterrupted attendance at a high school or institution of higher education.

Educational features of the bill which provide for a course in military and naval theory in institutions of higher learning would be administered under a board the majority of which would be made up of civilian educators. Chairman of the board would be

the United States Commissioner of Education; three of the Nation's outstanding college or university presidents appointed by the President of the United States; the Chief of Staff of the United States Army; the Chief of Naval Operations; and the Commandant of the Marine Corps.

Under CARVILLE's plan all youth would be required to register for military service upon reaching 18 years of age. Those attending high school would be automatically deferred until they drop such course or graduate.

Those desiring and capable of qualifying for a course at a college, university, or other institution would be permitted to pursue such course.

There would be no actual military training for those attending institutions of higher learning during the regular school but the annual 3-month vacation period would be spent in an Army, Navy, or Marine Corps training camp.

CARVILLE explained that upon completion of a regular 4-year course at a school of higher learning a youth would have automatically completed his required year's military service. Any youth who dropped out of college before completing the 4-year course would be required to immediately serve any unexpired portion of his military service.

It was explained the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps would furnish instructors and all necessary textbooks for those courses in military theory which would supplement the educational course selected by each student.

CARVILLE expressed the belief his bill not only would meet the necessity of providing a well-trained military force for the Nation but would offer an incentive for youth to obtain a better education. He called attention to recent reports showing approximately 80 percent of the high-school graduates of the Nation never attend college and expressed the belief if his bill was enacted, a greater percentage would avail themselves of the opportunity for a higher education.

Statistics which showed there now are more than 20,000,000 persons of military age in the United States who never went beyond the sixth grade also were quoted. In this connection it is CARVILLE's belief his proposal would greatly increase the number who at least complete a high-school course.

CARVILLE explained that under his measure those who so desire may take the full year of military training before entering an institution of higher learning.

In all respects except for its educational features CARVILLE's bill follows closely the pattern of the present selective-service law. Under the bill selective-service boards would continue to register youth and administer military features of the law.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and myself, I submit a concurrent resolution in relation to the Presidential succession and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and a few words of explanation are in order.

A number of bills have been introduced in the Senate and House relating to this subject with the purpose of remedying the present uncertainty and inadequacy of existing law, but none of them have attempted to deal with all existing uncertainties and inadequacies.

A study of the subject shows that there are far-reaching and fundamental questions which need to be answered. These questions are interrelated and should all be answered by one comprehensive plan. It is hoped that the joint congressional committee provided in this joint resolution may devise such a plan.

The joint congressional committee will represent both houses and both parties and I hope its recommendations may be such as to entitle them to be enacted into law and thus remove all uncertainties as to the Presidential succession.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 50), submitted by Mr. GREEN for himself and Mr. SMITH, was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby created a joint congressional committee to be composed of five Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate and five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The joint committee shall select a chairman from among its members. A vacancy in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original appointment.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all matters connected with the succession to the Presidency, and the election of the President and Vice President from the time of the nomination of the President and Vice President, through the time of their election and the time of their inauguration until the termination of their respective terms of office, with the purpose of making the law certain as to the Presidential election and succession. These matters shall include, but shall not be confined to, the following:

(1) Whether or not the President and Vice President should be elected by the Electoral College, as at present, and if so whether or not the members should be legally bound to vote in accordance with their instructions.

(2) Whether or not provision should be made for the case where before the election of Presidential electors, or after such time but before the election of President and Vice President, a candidate for the Presidency or for the Vice Presidency dies, declines to run, or is found ineligible to take office if elected.

(3) Whether or not provision should be made for the case of the death of any of the individuals from whom the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them, and for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them.

(4) Whether or not provision should be made for the case where, after election, the President-elect or Vice President-elect, or both, die, decline to serve, or fail to qualify.

(5) How it shall be determined whether the President, or individual acting as President, is unable to execute the powers and duties of the office, and how the duration of such inability shall be determined.

(6) Whether or not provision should be made for an individual to execute the office of President in case of removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President, including provision for selecting an individual to execute such office in cases where by reason of removal, death, resignation or inability there is no individual upon whom the powers and duties of such office would otherwise automatically devolve.

(7) Whether there are, or should be, any differences between the status, powers, duties, and privileges of an elected President and any other individual executing the office of President.

SEC. 3. The joint committee shall report to the Senate and House of Representatives the results of its study and investigation to-

gether with its recommendations, including drafts of legislation recommended and of any proposed constitutional amendments considered necessary or desirable. The joint committee shall submit its final report to the Senate and House of Representatives not later than May 1, 1946, and thereupon the existence of the joint committee shall terminate.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this concurrent resolution, the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Congress, to employ counsel, clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed \$10,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee.

JANICE MCKELLAR

Mr. STEWART submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 214), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Janice McKellar, widow of D. W. McKellar, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF MARTIAL LAW IN HAWAII

Mr. MCCARRAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 216), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the administration of martial law in the Territory of Hawaii subsequent to December 7, 1941, including suspension of the writ of habeas corpus, peonage, involuntary servitude, other infringement of constitutional rights of civilians, and other abuses or alleged abuses in connection therewith.

Such committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is further authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the operation of the courts-martial systems of the Army and Navy, both within the United States and abroad, and of the prisons, jails, and other places of incarceration or confinement of Army and Navy prisoners, with particular emphasis on (1) alleged miscarriages of justice arising out of the operation of such systems and places of incarceration or confinement; (2) the question of whether variations in such systems or in the administration and application thereof, in different areas or theaters of operations, with respect to review procedure or otherwise, constitutes or has constituted denial of due process or of equal protection of law in violation or derogation of the Constitution of the United States; (3) the question of whether or not punishments meted under such systems are unduly excessive; (4) the alleged lack of uniformity in punishments meted under such systems; (5)

the question of whether or not present methods of holding courts martial are desirable and proper; and (6) any desirable improvements in or modifications of such courts-martial systems and places of incarceration or the administration thereof.

The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date not later than December 15, 1946, the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

AN INTERNATIONAL CREED—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *Record* a statement of international creed, issued by him on January 5, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPHCY OF REPUBLICAN VICTORY—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *Record* a statement issued by him on January 14, 1946, entitled "Senator WILEY Predicts Victory of Conservative Republicans and Repudiation of New Deal Blunders," which appears in the Appendix.]

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BANKHEAD

[Mr. BANKHEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *Record* an address on the subject of the proposed universal military training program, delivered by him over the radio at Birmingham, Ala., on January 6, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE HOUSING PROBLEM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *Record* an address on the housing problem delivered by him before the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce on January 7, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS ABROAD AND ECONOMIC ISSUES AT HOME—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HOEY

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *Record* an address delivered by him at the annual chamber of commerce dinner at Gastonia, N. C., on January 11, 1946, on the subject of serious international problems abroad and critical economic issues at home, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MORSE ON THE TWENTY-FIFTH RADIO ANNIVERSARY

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *Record* an address delivered by him at a citizens' committee banquet honoring the twenty-fifth radio anniversary, at New York City, on November 10, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE AMERICAN FUTURE—ADDRESS BY WHEELER McMILLEN

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *Record* an address entitled "The American Future," delivered by

Wheeler McMillen, editor in chief, *Farm Journal*, before the Pro-America Club at East Orange, N. J., on November 8, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH FOUNDATION—EDITORIAL FROM NEWARK EVENING NEWS

[Mr. SMITH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *Record* an editorial entitled "Solely for Science," relating to proposals to create a scientific research foundation, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PEARL HARBOR INQUIRY—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *Record* an editorial entitled "The Pearl Harbor Inquiry," published in the *New York Times* of January 5, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

PREVENTION OF DENTAL DECAY—STATEMENT BY THE DENTAL PROFESSION OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *Record* a statement entitled "Prevention of Dental Decay," prepared by the Dental Profession of New Hampshire, which appears in the Appendix.]

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY

[Mr. BRIGGS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *Record* a report on the Missouri Valley Authority and a statement in support and clarification of the official report of the Missouri Commission studying the Tennessee Valley and the Missouri Valley, which appear in the Appendix.]

JUDAISM AND RACE RELATIONS—STATEMENT BY RABBI FERDINAND M. ISSERMAN

[Mr. BRIGGS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *Record* a statement on Judaism and Race Relations by Rabbi Ferdinand M. Isserman, Chairman, Justice and Peace Commission, which appears in the Appendix.]

NORTH DAKOTA'S PROHIBITION OF CORPORATION FARMING—EDITORIAL FROM THE BISMARCK LEADER

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *Record* an editorial entitled "An Old, Old Fight," from the *Leader*, Bismarck, N. Dak., of January 3, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMITTEE—LETTER FROM ALFRED BAKER LEWIS

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *Record* a letter dated January 11, 1946, addressed to the Washington Post by Alfred Baker Lewis, dealing with the Fair Employment Practice Committee, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NEW WORLD COURT—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *Record* an editorial entitled "The New World Court," published in the *New York Times* for January 15, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNIFICATION OF THE ARMED SERVICES—EDITORIAL FROM THE PORTLAND OREGONIAN

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *Record* an editorial from the *Portland Oregonian* of December 21, 1945, entitled "Why Take It to Congress?" relating to the unification of the armed services, which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATOR MORSE TAKES OVER—EDITORIAL FROM PORTLAND OREGONIAN

[Mr. CORDON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *Record* an editorial en-

titled "Senator MORSE Takes Over," published in the *Portland Oregonian* of January 8, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

IMPORTATION OF SWISS WATCHES—LETTER PUBLISHED IN PORTLAND OREGONIAN

[Mr. CORDON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *Record* a letter relative to the importation of Swiss watches, addressed to the *Portland Oregonian* by Mr. Tom Burns, and published in the *Portland Oregonian* of December 23, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY—REMOVAL OF TIME LIMIT FOR HOLDING OF HEARINGS, ETC.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry I submit a brief report on Senate bill 555, to establish a Missouri Valley Authority. Inasmuch as the report suggests a change which must be made by the Senate, I ask that the report be read. Later I shall ask unanimous consent that the report be adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be read.

The report (No. 889) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (S. 555), to establish a Missouri Valley Authority to have jurisdiction and powers as provided in said bill, proceeded to the consideration of such measure in a meeting held on this date—Thursday, January 17, 1946.

The first witness called was the author of the bill, Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, who made a brief statement to the effect that due to the press of business he had not been able to prepare the data deemed necessary to be presented to the committee for its consideration in connection with the hearings on the measure.

Due to the fact that the Senate has pending before it many important bills and proposals having to do with reconversion, Senator MURRAY, author of the bill, recommended that the committee postpone hearings on the measure for the time being.

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry gave consideration to the statement and recommendations made by the author of the bill and authorized the chairman of the committee to make a brief report to the Senate and to request that the time limit heretofore fixed by the Senate for the holding of hearings and the submission of a report on the said bill, S. 555, be abrogated and set aside and that the said bill remain in the Agriculture and Forestry Committee for future consideration and action as may be hereafter determined by said committee.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, in order that the time limit fixed by the Senate for the committee to hold hearings and submit a report may be abrogated, it is necessary for the Senate to take some action. So at the instance of the author of the bill, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who is not prepared at this time to proceed with the bill because of the press of other business, I ask unanimous consent that the time limit be removed, and that the bill remain in the hands of the committee for such consideration in the future as the committee may see fit to give it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I have had no opportunity to check with any of the minority members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Can the Senator inform me whether what he is now proposing has been discussed with the minority members, and whether or not it is agreeable to them?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The committee held a meeting this morning at 10:30, with practically the full committee present in person. The absentees were represented by proxies. The minority side was most liberally represented by its members. I think they were practically all present. The Members who reside in the Missouri Valley are agreed on this recommendation. The report is a unanimous report by all members of the committee, present or represented by proxy; and the proxies understood the request to be submitted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF POLICIES AND ACTIVITIES OF OFFICES OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION AND ECONOMIC STABILIZATION

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, last July the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and I submitted Senate Resolution 153, providing for an investigation and study of OPA activities and problems, anticipating what the able Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and the able Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] were discussing a moment ago in respect to the confusion with regard to the price of cotton.

In submitting this resolution we made the statement at the time that we thought that OPA had done a good job during the war period, that the war would soon be over, and that the problems of OPA after the war had ended would be entirely different from those which it faced during the war period.

The resolution provided for the appointment of a committee by this body to study the problem, and to cooperate with the OPA. Nothing happened to the resolution. It was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and it is still before that committee.

It is my honest opinion that much, if not all, of our troubles today are due to our failure to study the rationing and pricing policies of OPA as they affect our peacetime economy. It is my opinion that had we investigated, studied, and cooperated with OPA, as we might, and as we should, as long ago as last July, we might have avoided the confusion which exists in the business world today. I question very much if there would be any strikes today if we had done so. It is my opinion that peacetime production would be on its way.

I do not believe that it is too late yet. I wish to say to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency that I sincerely trust that he will call a meeting of his committee, consider our resolution, and report it favorably to the Senate so that we may vote on it.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. I entirely agree with what the distinguished Senator from Indiana has said. I know that the price ceiling structure of OPA as related to textiles is the cause of the terrible clothing shortage in the United States. Next week I hope to speak at length on that subject.

Furthermore, Mr. President, we all desire that inflation be prevented. The way to prevent inflation is to get production. OPA has prevented the production of a vast amount of goods, and in my judgment its policies are very inflationary. If we go into a spiral of inflation, it will be because of this agency. Therefore, Mr. President, I believe that OPA should be abolished.

Mr. CAPEHART. I thank the Senator.

PROCEDURE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I merely wish to call attention to what I have frequently called attention to in the past, namely, the use of the morning hour. From time immemorial the morning hour has been set aside for definite purposes: The introduction of bills and resolutions, the presentation of petitions and memorials, and other matters set forth in the rule. The morning hour was never intended to be a time for speech making. I have frequently urged that Senators observe the rule without having to have their attention called to it and without having to have the Chair call attention to it. Senators come here during the morning hour in order that they may introduce bills, submit resolutions and do whatever else they are required to do at that time, and they are entitled to be recognized promptly for such purposes. Many Members of the Senate have committee assignments and other work to which they may wish to attend, and it is not in the interest of the orderly handling of legislation to have Senators consume the morning hour by making speeches. I am not making this statement in criticism of any Senator who has made a speech today; but I simply wish to serve notice, as I have done so many times in the past, that during the session which we are just beginning I shall request that the rule be observed; and unless we are confronted with an extraordinary circumstance which I cannot now anticipate, I shall feel it my duty to object to the making of speeches by any Senator during the morning hour. I hope Senators will not make it necessary for their colleagues to object to a violation of the rule, which has been one of the rules of the Senate ever since any present Member of the Senate has been here, in order that this period during the daily sessions of the Senate may be devoted to the purposes for which it was inaugurated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thanks the Senator from Kentucky, because it is very embarrassing to the Chair, just as it is to the Senator from Kentucky and other Senators, to

have to call attention to the necessity for observance of the rule. The morning hour is to be devoted to what is known as the morning business, which is largely concerned with matters of routine. The Chair thinks that all Senators should conform to the unwritten rule and should not make speeches during the morning hour.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, permit me to suggest to the Chair that the rule is not an unwritten one. The rule prohibits the making of speeches during the morning hour.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky is entirely correct in that respect; but we have a rule about unanimous consent, and it is frequently invoked.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I understand that. Of course, the Senate can do anything here by means of unanimous consent. Let me further observe that I do not know of any speech which is so important that it must be made during the morning hour, and thus displace the handling of routine business.

COVERAGE OF CERTAIN DRUGS UNDER THE FEDERAL NARCOTIC LAWS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2348) to provide for the coverage of certain drugs under the Federal narcotic laws, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. GEORGE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. GEORGE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, and Mr. TAFT conferees on the part of the Senate.

RETIREMENT OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN OF THE NAVY, MARINE CORPS, AND COAST GUARD

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1405) to authorize the President to retire certain officers and enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes, which were, on page 3, line 10, after "in", to insert "permanent."

On page 3, line 11, after "to", insert "the permanent rank of."

On page 4, line 9, strike out all after "with" down to and including "rank", in line 17, and insert "his permanent rank: Provided, That if a board appointed pursuant to section 1 or section 2 of this act shall determine that an officer's performance of duty entitles him to a higher rank in which he has satisfactorily served on active duty under a temporary appointment, the officer shall be placed on the retired list with such higher rank as determined by the board, but no officer shall be placed on the retired list with rank lower than his permanent rank."

On page 5, line 9, strike out all after "(c)" down to and including "1945", in

line 11, and insert "The highest rank in which an officer served on or prior to June 30, 1946, or if a prisoner of war at any time during World War II, the highest rank to which an officer was temporarily appointed pursuant to the provisions of the act approved July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603)."

On page 6, line 11, strike out all after "status", down to and including "appointment", in lines 13 and 14, and insert "their permanent grade and rank."

On page 6, line 16, after "amended", insert: "Provided, That if a board appointed by the Secretary of the Navy shall determine that their performance of duty entitles them to higher grade and rank in which they satisfactorily served on active duty under a temporary appointment, they shall be placed on the retired list with such higher grade and rank as determined by the board, but no officer shall be placed on the retired list with rank lower than his permanent rank."

On page 7, line 2, strike out all after "be" down to and including "rank", in line 7, and insert "placed upon the retired list with their permanent grade or rank: *Provided*, That if a board appointed by the Secretary of the Navy shall determine that their performance of duty entitles them to higher grades and ranks in which they satisfactorily served on active duty under a temporary appointment, they shall be placed on the retired list with such higher rank as determined by the board, but no officer shall be placed on the retired list with rank lower than his permanent rank: *Provided further*, That such officers shall receive retired pay computed at the rate prescribed by law and applicable to each individual case but based upon the rank with which retired."

On page 7, line 15, strike out "their permanent" and insert "the."

On page 7, line 16, strike out "to which they are entitled under other provisions of law" and insert "with which they were retired or returned to an inactive status unless under other provisions of law they are entitled to higher grades, ranks, or ratings."

On page 7, line 17, strike out all after "(e)" down to and including "1945", in line 20, and insert "The highest rank in which an officer served on or prior to June 30, 1946, or if a prisoner of war at any time during World War II the highest rank to which an officer was temporarily appointed pursuant to the provisions of this act."

On page 8, line 11, strike out all after "pay" down to and including "rank", in line 12, and insert "at the rate of 2½ percent of the active-duty pay with longevity credit of the rank with which retired, multiplied by the number of years of service for which entitled to credit in the computation of his pay while on active duty, not to exceed a total of 75 percent of said active-duty pay: *Provided*, That a fractional year of 6 months or more shall be considered a full year in computing the number of years of service by which the rate of 2½ percent is multiplied: *Provided further*, That an officer whose computation of pay on the active list is not based upon years of

service shall receive as retired pay 75 percent of his active-duty pay."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. WALSH, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. TOBEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADDITIONAL INDUCEMENTS TO CITIZENS TO MAKE THE NAVAL SERVICE A CAREER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1438) to provide additional inducements to citizens of the United States to make the United States naval service a career, and for other purposes, which were, on page 1, lines 6 and 7, strike out "subsequent to June 30, 1945," and insert "prior to the date of approval of this act."

On page 2, lines 14 and 15, to strike out "serving in the Regular Navy on June 25, 1938,"

On page 2, line 17, to strike out all after "months", down to and including "1938," in line 19.

On page 3, line 1, after "pay", insert "(including all permanent additions thereto)."

On page 3, line 9, after "pay", insert "(including all permanent additions thereto)."

On page 3, line 10, after "pay", insert "(including all permanent additions thereto)."

On page 3, line 13, after "of", where it appears the first time, insert "this section and of."

On page 3, line 16, strike out all after "receive:" down to and including "receive:" in line 20.

On page 4, line 21, after "the", insert "enlisted."

On page 4, line 23, strike out "promotion" and insert "advancement in rating."

On page 5, line 2, strike out "Provided" and insert "Provided, That such pay (including all permanent additions thereto) shall not exceed 75 percent of the pay (including all permanent additions thereto) of the highest rating to which entitled under the provisions of this section: *Provided further*."

On page 5, line 6, strike out all after "206:" down to and including "list:" in line 11.

On page 5, line 14, strike out "and provided" and insert "Provided."

On page 5, line 17, after "thereto", insert "And provided further, That persons of the classes described in this section who have been retired or returned to an inactive-duty status prior to the date of approval of this act shall be entitled to the benefits of this section from the date of retirement or return to an inactive-duty status."

On page 5, strike out lines 18 to 24, inclusive.

On page 6, line 1, strike out "5" and insert "4."

On page 7, line 19, strike out "6" and insert "5."

On page 9, strike out lines 7 to 12, inclusive, and insert:

Sec. 6. An enlisted man of the Army of the United States, or any component thereof, who is discharged while on active duty on or after June 1, 1945, for the purpose of enlisting or reenlisting in the Regular Establishment of any of the armed forces, and any enlisted man of any component of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, who is discharged while on active duty on or after February 1, 1945, for such purpose, shall be entitled to the travel allowance authorized by the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 166), as amended (34 U. S. C. 895): *Provided*, That any such person who has received a furlough travel allowance pursuant to section 6 of the act approved October 6, 1945 (Public Law 190, 79th Cong.), shall be paid in connection with such discharge only so much of the travel allowance authorized by the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 166), as amended (34 U. S. C. 895), as exceeds the amount of such furlough travel allowance.

On page 9, after line 12, insert:

Sec. 7. Any person who has performed active enlisted service as a member of the Regular Army during the period from June 1, 1945, to a date 121 days after the approval of this act and who shall have completed 16 but less than 20 years of active service, may upon his own request be transferred to the Enlisted Reserve Corps and thereupon will be placed on the retired list of the Regular Army. An enlisted man so retired shall, except when on active duty, receive annual pay at the rate of one-third of the average annual enlisted base pay he was receiving for the last 6 months of his active enlisted service, plus all longevity pay. The pay (including longevity pay) authorized by this section shall be increased 10 percent for any enlisted man who is credited with extraordinary heroism in line of duty: *Provided*, That the determination of the Secretary of War as to the definition of extraordinary heroism shall be final and conclusive for all purposes.

Sec. 8. (a) Section 4 of the act approved October 6, 1945 (Public Law 190, 79th Cong.), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 4. Whenever any enlisted man of the Regular Army shall have completed 20 but less than 30 years of active service, he may upon his own request be transferred to the Enlisted Reserve Corps and thereupon will be placed on the retired list of the Regular Army. An enlisted man so retired shall receive, except when on active duty, annual pay equal to 2½ percent of the average annual enlisted base pay he was receiving for the last 6 months of his active enlisted service multiplied by a sum equal to the sum of the number of years of his active service performed not in excess of 29 years, plus all longevity pay. The pay (including longevity pay) authorized by this section shall be increased 10 percent for any enlisted man who is credited with extraordinary heroism in line of duty or for any enlisted man having 20 or more years' active service whose character and efficiency meet such requirements as may be prescribed in regulations by the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That the determination of the Secretary of War as to the definition of extraordinary heroism shall be final and conclusive for all purposes: *Provided further*, That the total pay (including longevity pay) authorized by this section shall not exceed 75 percent of the average annual enlisted pay (including longevity pay) such enlisted man was receiving for the last 6 months of his active enlisted service."

(b) The number of years of service to be credited in computing the right to retirement and retired pay authorized by section 7 or 8 of this act, or any other provision of

law providing for the retirement of an enlisted man of the Regular Army, shall include all active Federal military service performed in the Army of the United States, the Navy, the Marine Corps, or the Coast Guard, or any component thereof, any fractional part of a year amounting to 6 months or more to be counted as a complete year.

(c) Any enlisted man retired under the provisions of section 4 of the act approved October 6, 1945 (Public Law 190, 79th Cong.), shall, commencing the first day of the month following the effective date of this act, receive retired pay computed as provided in section 8 (a) of this act.

SEC. 9. Any enlisted man who is transferred to the Enlisted Reserve Corps pursuant to the provisions of section 7 or 8 of this act shall remain a member thereof until his active Federal military service performed prior to such transfer plus the period of his service in such Corps equals 30 years, and while a member of such Corps shall be subject to perform such periods of active duty as may now or hereafter be prescribed by law.

SEC. 10. (a) Each enlisted man of the Regular Army retired under the provisions of sections 7 or 8 of this act or the provisions of section 4 of the act approved October 6, 1945 (Public Law 190, 79th Cong.), who performs or has performed active military service subsequent to retirement shall, upon relief from such active duty, receive retired pay in the amount received by him prior to his recall to active duty, or in the amount resulting from a recomputation, whichever is the greater. In such recomputation, credit shall be granted for the period of such subsequent active military service in determining his retired pay, and the amount of such retired pay shall be computed in the manner prescribed by section 7 or 8 (a) of this act, whichever is applicable depending upon his total years of active service.

(b) Each enlisted man of the Regular Army retired under the provisions of the act of March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1217; 10 U. S. C. 947), who performs or has performed active military service subsequent to retirement shall, upon relief from such active duty, receive retired pay in the amount received by him prior to his recall to active duty, or in the amount resulting from a recomputation, whichever is the greater. In such recomputation, the amount of his retired pay shall be 75 percent of the average annual enlisted pay (including longevity pay) he was receiving for the last 6 months of his active enlisted service.

SEC. 11. No back pay for any period prior to the date of enactment of this act shall accrue to any person by reason of the enactment of sections 7, 8, and 10 of this act.

Amend the title so as to read as follows: "An act to provide additional inducements to citizens of the United States to make a career of the United States Military or Naval Service, and for other purposes."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the bill deals solely with naval subjects. On the floor of the House of Representatives an amendment relating to careers in the Army was offered. I do not care to take the responsibility in conference of deciding whether to accept the amendment. Therefore, I move that the matter be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs in order that it may give to the Naval Affairs Committee an opinion regarding the amendment which affects and relates to the Army.

The motion was agreed to.

GRANT OF PATENT LICENSES BY ALUMINUM CO. OF AMERICA

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I wish to present three letters in connection

with what has been a vexatious controversy. The first letter is from the Aluminum Co. of America to the Surplus Property Administrator. In its letter the company agrees to grant a royalty-free license to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under its patents relating to the extraction of alumina from low-grade bauxite, for use in the Government-owned alumina plant at Hurricane Creek, Ark. That step is taken with a view to the issuance of such licenses in a nonexclusive manner to other corporations.

I wish to read a rather significant paragraph from the second letter, which is from the Surplus Property Administrator to the chairman of the board of the Aluminum Co. of America, Mr. Arthur V. Davis, thanking him and expressing the satisfaction of the Government:

The Aluminum Co. of America made an outstanding contribution to the winning of the war, for which this Nation should be forever grateful. Your public-spirited action in giving the Government a free license under your alumina patents for use at the Hurricane Creek plant is, of course, less dramatic, but nonetheless an equally significant contribution to the winning of the peace.

The third letter, which is from the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Clark, is in similar vein.

Mr. President, we have reached the end of a long controversy, and the end is a sound, satisfactory, and constructive one. There will be no monopoly in America now in respect to the manufacture of aluminum, and I think there will be peace between this great corporation, which did have a monopoly, and the Government. I should like to say that I happen to know that the Aluminum Co. of America came to the war period, in 1939, with 300,000,000 pounds of aluminum and a great plant prepared to produce aluminum at the rate of 1,000,000,000 pounds a year. But for that fact, this country would have been in a very bad plight. But the country did not consider that the capacity of the Alcoa Corp. was sufficient, and it undertook to create a capacity exceeding 2,000,000,000 pounds a year. It had to build plants in the Middle West, in the South, and in the far West. It is rather remarkable, to me, that the Aluminum Co. of America aided in the building of those plants, supplied the Government with engineers and the designs, and in addition went into debt to the extent of \$300,000,000 in order to enlarge its own capacity. The consequence was that this country had all the aluminum it needed at all times throughout that trying period. Now our country has a great surplus, and the consequence of the surplus in plants and in capacity is that we have gone immediately into a period of free competition in the production of this invaluable metal.

Mr. President, I send the three letters to the desk and request that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. W. STUART SYMINGTON,
Surplus Property Administrator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SYMINGTON: At a conference in your office yesterday afternoon, you requested us to grant a royalty-free license to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under our patents relating to the extraction of alumina from low-grade bauxite, for use in the Government-owned alumina plant at Hurricane Creek, Ark., which is about to be leased to Reynolds Metals Co. You explained that this would enable the Reynolds Co. to manufacture alumina at Hurricane Creek on a low-cost basis and in tremendous quantities. The Hurricane Creek plant has an annual capacity of 1,555,000,000 pounds of alumina, sufficient to smelt 800,000,000 pounds of aluminum annually. You pointed out that this operation would assure the availability of quantities of low-cost alumina adequate for the smelting of aluminum not only at the Government-owned aluminum smelting plant at Jones Mills, Ark., which is also being leased to the Reynolds Co., but also to any or all of the three Government-owned aluminum smelting plants in the Pacific Northwest, as well as to other smelters of aluminum. You urged upon us that a royalty-free license would aid the Government in putting the Hurricane Creek alumina plant into immediate and permanent operation on advantageous terms, that this would greatly assist you in your aluminum plant disposal program, and that it would be a substantial aid to the further development of competition in the smelting of aluminum.

In view of the public considerations which you presented so effectively we are glad to grant your request. We will grant the Reconstruction Finance Corporation a royalty-free nonexclusive license for use at the Hurricane Creek alumina plant under all of our existing patents relating to the extraction of alumina from bauxite. Such patents (herein sometimes referred to as "the alumina patents") cover three inventions: (1) The use of the lime-soda-sinter process in combination with the Bayer process—United States patents Nos. 2,375,342 and 2,375,343; (2) continuous digestion—United States patent No. 2,107,919; and (3) the use of starch as a settling and filtering aid—United States patent No. 2,280,998.

The license will include the right to sublicense for use at the Hurricane Creek plant. As a term of the license, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and any licensee will grant the Aluminum Co. of America a non-exclusive royalty-free license, with right to sublicense, under any patents used at the Hurricane Creek alumina plant by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or a licensee which are improvements upon the alumina patents and which are owned or controlled either by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or such sublicensee or under which either has a right to sublicense others. We will cooperate with you in the prompt preparation of a patent license to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation on the royalty-free basis above set forth.

The alumina patents are of great value. They cover inventions which make possible the extraction of alumina from low-grade bauxite at Hurricane Creek on a basis competitive with the older Bayer process utilizing high-grade bauxite. Without them, the economical and continued operation of the Hurricane Creek plant would be impossible. The alumina patents represent many years of research by Aluminum Co. of America. We have spent many millions of dollars in perfecting the processes covered by the alumina patents. Our records indicate that they effect a conservatively estimated saving of \$10 to \$12 a ton in the manufacture of alumina from low-grade bauxite.

Except for the public considerations which you have presented to us so effectively, we

JANUARY 19, 1946.

could not consider a royalty-free license under such a valuable asset. However, we are glad to accede to these considerations and, if by so doing we have contributed in any substantial way to the solution of the complex problems of surplus property disposal confronting the Congress, the Surplus Property Administration, and other governmental agencies, we are well repaid.

Yours very truly,
ALUMINUM CO. OF AMERICA,
ARTHUR V. DAVIS, *Chairman.*

JANUARY 10, 1946.

MR. ARTHUR V. DAVIS,
Chairman of the Board, Aluminum Co. of America, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DAVIS: I want to thank you and the Aluminum Co. of America for granting our request for a free license on the company's alumina patents for use at the Government-owned alumina plant at Hurricane Creek.

Without those patents, the Hurricane Creek plant could not be successfully operated. Under the free license which you have agreed to grant, however, the immediate and permanent operation of Hurricane Creek on a low-cost basis is assured.

This will make available an additional large quantity of low-cost alumina, the key to the Surplus Property Administration's aluminum plant disposal program.

The Aluminum Co. of America made an outstanding contribution to the winning of the war, for which this Nation should be forever grateful. Your public-spirited action in giving the Government a free license under your alumina patents for use at the Hurricane Creek plant is, of course, less dramatic but nonetheless an equally significant contribution to the winning of the peace.

If in the past I have had occasion to be critical of the Aluminum Co. of America, today's action on your part demonstrates to my complete satisfaction that your company, no less than the Government agencies concerned, is moving constructively toward the solution of the problems which confront the Surplus Property Administration, the aluminum industry, and the country as a whole.

Sincerely yours,
W. STUART SYMINGTON,
Administrator.

JANUARY 10, 1946.

HON. W. STUART SYMINGTON,
Administrator, Surplus Property Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SYMINGTON: I have just been informed that an understanding has been reached between you, as Surplus Property Administrator, Mr. Sam Husbands, as Director of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and representatives of the Aluminum Co. of America, whereby the Aluminum Co. of America agrees to grant to Reconstruction Finance Corporation a nonexclusive license under its patents covering operations at the Hurricane Creek alumina plant, with the right to sublicense these patents. I am advised that the Aluminum Co. of America has agreed that the license shall be royalty-free. I am also advised that arrangements have been concluded whereby Reconstruction Finance Corporation will lease the Government-owned Hurricane Creek alumina plant and the Government-owned smelting plant at Jones Mills, Ark., to Reynolds Metals Co., and will sublicense to Reynolds Metals Co. the patents covered by the royalty-free license granted by the Aluminum Co. of America.

I want to express my gratification at the outcome of these negotiations. The consummation of this lease and the granting of this license on the terms above stated should contribute substantially to the establishment of real competition in the aluminum industry. It is entirely in line with the objective of this Department in the pending antitrust suit.

It is this teamwork of Government and business—evidenced by the public-spirited action of Alcoa in granting a royalty-free license and in the cooperative spirit of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and Surplus Property Administration—that will get the reconversion job done. My hearty congratulations to all of you.

Sincerely yours,
TOM C. CLARK,
Attorney General.

MR. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to add just a word of commendation in regard to the Aluminum Co. of America, because the plant the Senator from North Carolina has mentioned, namely, the one at Hurricane Creek, is in Arkansas, and I am sure it will promote the development of competition in the industry and will help put it on a sound basis.

MR. BAILEY. I think it has a billion pounds capacity.

MR. FULBRIGHT. A billion and a half.

MR. BAILEY. A billion and a half pounds. That is competition in itself.

MR. FULBRIGHT. I think the Aluminum Co. of America deserves considerable credit for its forward-looking attitude in reaching a compromise with the Government.

APPOINTMENT OF FACT-FINDING BOARDS TO INVESTIGATE LABOR DISPUTES—DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

MR. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The Senator will state it.

MR. CHAVEZ. Has the morning business been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not been concluded.

MR. EASTLAND. On behalf of the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] and myself, I send forward to the desk a resolution, which I ask to have read under the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 215) submitted by Mr. EASTLAND for himself and Mr. O'DANIEL, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Education and Labor be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1661) to provide for the appointment of fact-finding boards to investigate labor disputes seriously affecting the national public interest, and for other purposes.

MR. MURRAY. Mr. President, I object to the present consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not being presently considered. The resolution will lie over under the rule.

HIGHER PRICES AS TAX HEDGE—PERSONAL STATEMENT

MR. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, out of order I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an Associated Press news story which appeared in today's Washington Post. The article is entitled "Senator Urges Higher Prices as Tax Hedge." The article quotes me, and purports to set forth the substance of a conference to

which it refers. The last four lines of the news article are pied. Evidently the proofreader did not read the complete article, or, having read it, became disgusted before reaching the last four lines of it, because they are meaningless. In order that my position on this particular matter may be fully understood, and that the pied lines may be clarified, I ask unanimous consent that in addition to the entire news story being printed in the RECORD at this point there also be printed a short statement clarifying my position.

There being no objection, the article and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR URGES HIGHER PRICES AS TAX HEDGE

Senator ELMER THOMAS (Democrat, Oklahoma), called yesterday for higher prices, higher wages, higher pension—call it inflation if you want—as the only way to handle the huge public debt.

The chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee took his stand in an interview on the prospects of American farmers in 1946.

American producers, THOMAS said, must be allowed higher average prices in a market controlled only by supply and demand.

Otherwise, he said, taxpayers cannot square their tax bills. And we can't have another depression without the country going bankrupt.

DEMAND PRICE HEARINGS

The Oklahoma Senator expressed his views as two Republican Representatives from Wisconsin, REID F. MURRAY and LAWRENCE H. SMITH, issued separate demands on Congress to decide quickly what it plans to do about prices.

They introduced resolutions calling on the House Banking Committee to start hearings at once on extension of OPA and Government subsidy programs, both due to expire June 30. Each said such action would help curtail strikes.

Subsidies are Government funds paid to producers or processors to permit them to operate profitably despite OPA ceilings on prices.

If either is abolished, MURRAY told reporters, living costs will soar and cause a new rash of strikes for wage adjustments.

SMITH, principally concerned with the subsidy program, said its continuance is imperative to keep food and clothing prices down, and added in an interview:

"Some of us who were so violently opposed to subsidies originally are getting around to the point of thinking it is absolutely necessary that they continue now."

NEED MONEY FOR TAXES

THOMAS figured the people will be saddled with taxes of \$35,000,000,000 a year for some time to come, and we can't pay it at low price levels. He added:

"Take a man with a \$100 tax bill. With cotton at 10 cents a pound it takes two bales to pay the tax. With cotton at 20 cents a pound one bale will pay it."

The Senator noted that many people ordinarily suffer when prices go up—wage earners and people living on pensions and annuities.

His solution: "As prices go up, increase wages, salaries, and pensions comparably."

In support of his argument, THOMAS compared things now to 1926. Counting 1926 levels as 100, he said, the price levels now are 107. Yet the national debt is approaching 100 billion dollars, he proaching 300 billion dollars, he in 1926.

Today's Washington Post carries a news story by the Associated Press which purports to be statements made by myself.

The interview was with reference to the price level and at what point such price level should be fixed to enable our country to remain a going concern.

In the news story I was quoted as having said that our people are to be saddled with taxes of \$35,000,000,000 a year for some time to come. The natural inference being that the \$35,000,000,000 will be annual Federal taxes, which was not my full statement.

My statement in full was substantially as follows:

It is my judgment that for some years to come our people will be required to pay Federal taxes in the sum of \$25,000,000,000 annually, and that the States, counties, cities, and districts will levy and collect an additional \$10,000,000,000 annually, which will make a total tax burden of some \$35,000,000,000.

In the Post article the last paragraph obviously escaped the attention of the proof-reader. The last four lines of the article are pled; hence, do not make sense.

My further statement to the AP representative was substantially as follows:

The First World War ended on November 11, 1918, and it was some 8 years later before the Government was able to agree upon a price level as the basis for stabilization of our domestic economy.

In 1926 the national debt was approximately \$20,000,000,000. The Budget for that year was some \$4,250,000,000, and the administration then in power sought to stabilize prices on the basis of the average prices for which commodities sold during the year of 1926.

The administration considered the average wholesale prices of the various commodities during the said year as being 100 percent; hence, the price level of all commodities was fixed at 100 percent, and such price level has been the basis of all prices since that year.

The matter of the tabulation of the price level is under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and using the 100-percent wholesale price level, based on the said year of 1926, we find that today the said price level stands at 107. This means that the average price of some 900 commodities is today only 7 percent above the average price of the same commodity in the basic year of 1926.

Further clarifying the pled portion of the said news article, my statement was to the effect that the administration, in 1926, confronted with a national debt of only some \$20,000,000,000 and an annual Budget of only some \$4,250,000,000 undertook to stabilize our domestic economy on the 1926 average prices or with a then 100-percent price level.

Today our people are faced with a \$300,000,000,000 national debt and an annual Federal Budget of some \$25,000,000,000 with additional State, county, city, and district budgets totaling some \$10,000,000,000. It is obvious to me that the 1926 price level of 100, with the added 7-percent increase, must be further raised in order to permit our people to make the money necessary to pay the Federal, State, county, city, and district taxes necessary to keep our country and its subdivisions going concerns.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The morning business has now been concluded. The calendar under rule VIII is in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENT OF FACT-FINDING BOARDS TO INVESTIGATE LABOR DISPUTES—DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR—THE STRIKE SITUATION

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, earlier in the day I submitted a resolution to discharge the Senate Committee on

Education and Labor from further consideration of Senate bill 1661, a bill which embodies the recommendations of the President of the United States for the solution of disputes between capital and labor.

I have no criticism of the Committee on Education and Labor. I have no controversy or argument with the committee. I understand that hearings are now being held, and that in all probability a bill will be reported from the committee on February 1, 1946, or shortly thereafter. There is no assurance that a bill will be reported at that time.

Mr. President, this country is in the midst of a grave emergency. On the domestic front the emergency today is just as grave as it was in 1933 when the Roosevelt administration first assumed power. During the early days of that administration a great many far-reaching bills were enacted into law for the purpose of counteracting the depression. On those bills no long hearings were held. We are now in the midst of another emergency. Today the wheels of American industry are locked by strikes. Our entire basic industry is threatened, and I think the Congress of the United States should rise to the occasion and speedily consider antistrike legislation. I say frankly that I do not believe that the program which has been recommended by the President goes far enough. However, those are matters which can be debated and determined on the floor of the Senate. I venture the assertion that there is no one of us who has not stated in detail on a number of occasions what are his labor views, and the type of legislation which he desires to have enacted. I believe that a large majority of the Members of the Senate know at this time exactly what their position will be when the bill to which I have referred reaches the Senate floor. Without criticizing the committee, I fail to see the necessity of holding extended hearings on the bill. It was introduced on December 6, 1945. We have passed other "must" legislation without holding extensive hearings. This measure has been said by the President of the United States to be "must" legislation, and the American people say it is "must" legislation.

A strike is threatened in the steel industry, one of the basic industries of this country. If the strike should drag along for a sufficient length of time it would shut down the wheels of a great many other American industries.

There is now a strike in the packing plants. The meat supply of this Nation will be shut off. A great amount of livestock is being backed up on the farms. It cannot be marketed. There is a critical shortage of protein feeds. I heard a radio statement by a representative of one of the great feed mills of Kansas City, which had supplied feed for 225,000 cattle feeders in the Midwest, in explanation of the fact that it could not furnish the feeders with adequate supplies of protein feed in order to finish the livestock for market. The cotton crop this year is short, and from that source comes cottonseed meal which is one of the basic feeds. There is a critical shortage. Livestock in great amounts are being backed up on the

farms, thus further exhausting the feed. If the strike in the meat industry continues much longer, the dairy industry will suffer and it will become necessary to ration milk and dairy products in the United States.

There is a strike in farm-machinery plants. For 5 years the farmers of the United States have been unable to replace the equipment and the machinery which they sorely need in order to produce this country's food requirements and to meet our commitments throughout the earth. Millions of men are being discharged from the service, and a great many of them desire to go into the agricultural industry to earn their livelihood. A program has been adopted, as it should be, to give veterans priority in the purchase of tractors and other farm equipment; but, Mr. President, today they walk the streets in great numbers with a permit, and, though they have priorities in their pockets, they are unable to purchase this very essential equipment which they must have if they are to settle down and earn a livelihood and produce the food and feed and fiber which are so badly needed by the people of this earth.

Furthermore, there is a General Motors strike and other strikes. Labor conditions were bad enough in December, when the President said his bill was "must" legislation and asked for its immediate passage, but they are far worse today. Strikes are spreading and conditions become worse all the time, but the American Congress has not set up any machinery to settle the disputes between capital and labor and to return this country to an even keel.

These strikes, Mr. President, are war against the American people. They threaten the Nation's food supply. It is up to the Congress of the United States speedily and effectively to act as it acted in 1933. At that time the American Congress was at a high point in public esteem. We must act to settle the question who is boss in this country—the American Congress or the CIO. Frankly, if Congress cannot take effective action, then the CIO is sovereign in America. I mean that statement literally.

Mr. President, what is the first attribute of a sovereign? It is the power to lay and collect taxes. I hold in my hand a copy of the contract negotiated by Mr. Sidney Hillman for the American Garment Workers' Union whereby there is laid on the American people a tax of 3 percent of the pay roll of the garment workers in order to pay old-age pensions to members of that union. Then the attempt is made further to roll that back and levy a tax on the cotton producers of the United States.

The American Congress, Mr. President, must take action to demonstrate who controls the United States. If we cannot take action, then I favor abdicating and making Mr. Murray or Mr. Hillman king in name. Today certainly they exercise the very fundamental prerogatives of a sovereign.

Mr. President, I say again I have no controversy with and no criticism of the Senate committee which is considering this proposed legislation, but I think further consideration is unnecessary. I believe the Senate knows what it will do

with these bills and that they should be reported to the floor and speedily acted upon.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT

Mr. CHAVEZ obtained the floor.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President—

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield for a brief statement?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator later.

I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 101, Calendar No. 286.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MYERS in the chair). The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 101) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, do I understand correctly that the Senator moves that the bill be now considered by the Senate?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I have not discussed the matter with the Senator, but I understood he would perhaps address himself to the subject today but would not make the motion today. Am I in error in that understanding?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator is in error, and I have made the motion.

Mr. EASTLAND and Mr. WHITE addressed the Chair.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I make the point of order that the motion having been made prior to 2 o'clock and after the conclusion of the morning business it is not debatable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. WHITE. I make the point that there is not a quorum present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	Magnuson
Andrews	George	Maybank
Austin	Gerry	Mead
Ball	Gossett	Millikin
Barkley	Green	Morse
Bilbo	Guffey	Murray
Brewster	Gurney	Myers
Bridges	Hayden	O'Daniel
Briggs	Hicklenlooper	Overton
Buck	Hill	Revercomb
Bushfield	Huffman	Shipstead
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Capehart	Kilgore	Taft
Capper	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	Langer	Tobey
Cordon	Lucas	Tydings
Donnell	McCarran	Wherry
Downey	McClellan	White
Eastland	McFarland	Wiley
Ellender	McKellar	Wilson
Ferguson	McMahon	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 101, to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and vote "yea." I am informed that if present the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea."

Mr. MAGNUSON. My colleague the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL] is absent on official business. Were he present he would vote "yea."

Mr. BUTLER (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], which I transfer to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who would vote "yea" if present, and let my vote stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

The Senators from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY and Mr. HOEY] are attending an important conference dealing with the cotton situation, and are unavoidably absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on official business at various Government departments.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business as a representative of the United States attending the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, now being held in London.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] is absent on official business, as a member of the Mead committee.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senators from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY and Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] would vote "nay."

I wish to announce further that the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]

has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED].

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business as a representative of the United States attending the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations now being held in London.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent on official business as a member of the Mead committee. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] are necessarily absent. If present the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. I am not advised how he would vote. He is necessarily absent from the city.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANFILL] are unavoidably detained. Both Senators would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] are unavoidably absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] is unavoidably detained. If present he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 17, as follows:

YEAS—49

Aiken	Gossett	Morse
Austin	Green	Murray
Ball	Guffey	Myers
Barkley	Gurney	Revercomb
Brewster	Hayden	Shipstead
Bridges	Hicklenlooper	Smith
Briggs	Huffman	Taft
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Kilgore	Tobey
Capehart	La Follette	Tydings
Capper	Langer	Wherry
Chavez	Lucas	White
Cordon	McCarran	Wiley
Donnell	McFarland	Wilson
Downey	McMahon	Young
Ferguson	Magnuson	
Gerry	Mead	

NAYS—17

Andrews	Fulbright	Maybank
Bilbo	George	Millikin
Bushfield	Hill	O'Daniel
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Overton
Eastland	McClellan	Stewart
Ellender	McKellar	

NOT VOTING—30

Bailey	Knowland	Saltonstall
Bankhead	Mitchell	Stanfill
Brooks	Moore	Taylor
Carville	Murdoch	Thomas, Utah
Connally	O'Mahoney	Tunnell
Glass	Pepper	Vandenberg
Hart	Radcliffe	Wagner
Hatch	Reed	Walsh
Hawkes	Robertson	Wheeler
Hoey	Russell	Willis

So Mr. CHAVEZ's motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 101) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

The bill reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.,

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 1. The Congress finds that the practice of denying employment opportunities to, and discriminating in employment against, properly qualified persons by reason of their race, creed, color, national origin, or

ancestry, foments domestic strife and unrest, deprives the United States of the fullest utilization of its capacities for production, endangers the national security and the general welfare, and adversely affects commerce.

It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to eliminate such discrimination in all employment relations which fall within the jurisdiction or control of the Federal Government as hereinafter set forth.

RIGHT TO FREEDOM FROM DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT

SEC. 2. The right to work and to seek work without discrimination because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry is declared to be an immunity, of all citizens of the United States, which shall not be abridged by any State or by an instrumentality or creature of the United States or of any State.

UNFAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES DEFINED

SEC. 3. (a) It shall be an unfair employment practice for any employer within the scope of this act—

(1) to refuse to hire any person because of such person's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry;

(2) to discharge any person from employment because of such person's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry;

(3) to discriminate against any person in compensation or in other terms or conditions of employment because of such person's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; and

(4) to confine or limit recruitment or hiring of persons for employment to any employment agency, placement service, training school or center, labor union or organization, or any other source that discriminates against persons because of their race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry.

(b) It shall be an unfair employment practice for any labor union within the scope of this act—

(1) to deny full membership rights and privileges to any person because of such person's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry;

(2) to expel from membership any person because of such person's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; or

(3) to discriminate against any member, employer, or employee because of such person's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; or

(c) It shall be an unfair employment practice for any employer or labor union within the scope of this act to discharge, expel, or otherwise discriminate against any person because he has opposed any practices forbidden by this act or because he has filed a charge, testified, or assisted in any proceeding under this act.

SCOPE OF ACT

SEC. 4. (a) This act shall apply to any employer having in his employ six or more persons, who is (1) engaged in interstate or foreign commerce or in operations affecting such commerce; (2) under contract with the United States or any agency thereof or performing work, under subcontract or otherwise, called for by a contract to which the United States or any agency thereof is a party, awarded, negotiated, or renegotiated as hereinafter provided in section 13 of this act.

(b) This act shall apply to any labor union which has six or more members who are engaged in interstate or foreign commerce or in operations affecting such commerce or employed by the United States or any Territory, insular possession, or instrumentality thereof.

(c) This act shall apply to the employment practices of the United States and of every Territory, insular possession, agency, or instrumentality thereof, except that paragraphs (e) and (f) of section 10, providing for petitions for enforcement and review, shall not apply in any case in which an order has been issued against any department or

independent agency of the United States; but in any such case the Fair Employment Practice Commission established by section 5 of this act may petition the President for the enforcement of any such lawful order, and it shall thereupon be the duty of the President to take such measures as may secure obedience to any such order. Every officer, agent, or employee who willfully violates any such order shall be summarily discharged from the Government employment.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. For the purpose of securing enforcement of the foregoing rights and preventing unfair employment practices on the part of employers and labor unions, there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Fair Employment Practice Commission, which shall consist of a chairman and four additional members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall serve for a term of 5 years except that the terms of the members originally appointed shall expire seriatim at intervals of 1 year. Any member of the Commission may be removed by the President, upon notice and hearing, for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause. Three members of the Commission shall at all times constitute a quorum.

REPORTS

SEC. 6. The Commission shall at the close of each fiscal year make a report in writing to the Congress and to the President concerning the cases it has heard, the decisions it has rendered, the names, salaries, and duties of all employees and officers in the employ or under the supervision of the Commission, and an account of all moneys it has disbursed, and shall make such further reports on the cause of, and means of alleviating discrimination, and such recommendations for further legislation as may appear desirable.

SALARIES

SEC. 7. Each member of the Commission shall receive a salary of \$10,000 a year, shall be eligible for reappointment, and shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

TERMINATION OF COMMITTEE ON FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE

SEC. 8. Upon the appointment of the members of the Commission, the Committee on Fair Employment Practice, established by Executive Order Numbered 9346 of May 27, 1943, shall cease to exist. All employees of the said committee shall be transferred to and become employees of the Commission. All records, papers, and property of the committee shall pass into the possession of the Commission, and all unexpended funds and appropriations for the use and maintenance of the committee shall be available to the Commission.

LOCATION OF OFFICES

SEC. 9. The Commission shall hold its sessions in the District of Columbia and at such other places as it may designate. The Commission may, by one or more of its members or by such referees, agents, or agencies as it may designate, prosecute any inquiry or conduct any hearing necessary to its functions in any part of the United States or any Territory or insular possession thereof.

PROHIBITION OF UNFAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

SEC. 10. (a) The Commission is empowered as herein provided to prohibit any person from engaging in any unfair employment practices within the scope of this act.

(b) Whenever it is alleged that any person has engaged in any such unfair employment practice, the Commission, or any referee, agent, or agency designated by the Commission for such purposes, shall have power to issue and cause to be served upon such person a complaint stating the charges in that

respect and containing a notice of hearing before the Commission or a member thereof, or before a designated referee, agent, or agency at a place therein fixed not less than 10 days after the serving of said complaint.

(c) The person so complained of shall have the right to file an answer to such complaint and to appear in person or otherwise, with or without counsel, and give testimony at the place and time fixed in the complaint.

(d) If upon the record, including all the testimony taken, the Commission shall find that any person named in the complaint has engaged in any such unfair employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue and cause to be served on such person an order requiring such person to cease and desist from such unfair employment practice and to take such affirmative action, including reinstatement or hiring of employees with or without back pay, as will effectuate the policies of this act. If upon the record, including all the testimony taken, the Commission shall find that no person named in the complaint has engaged in any such unfair employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue an order dismissing the said complaint.

(e) The Commission shall have power to petition any circuit court of appeals of the United States (including the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia) or, if all the circuit courts of appeals to which application might be made are in vacation, any district court of the United States, within any circuit or district, respectively, wherein the unfair employment practice in question occurred, or wherein such person resides or transacts business, for the enforcement of such order and for appropriate temporary relief or restraining order, and shall certify and file in the court to which petition is made a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding, including the pleadings and testimony upon which such order was entered and the findings and the order of the Commission. Upon such filing, the court to which petition is made shall conduct further proceedings in conformity with the procedures and limitations established by law governing petitions for enforcement of the orders of the National Labor Relations Board.

(f) Any person aggrieved by a final order of the Commission granting or denying in whole or in part the relief sought may obtain a review of such order in any circuit court of appeals of the United States (including the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia) within any circuit wherein the unfair employment practice in question was alleged to have occurred or wherein such person resides or transacts business by filing in such court a written petition praying that the order of the Commission be modified or set aside. Upon such filing the reviewing court shall conduct further proceedings in conformity with the procedures and limitations established by law governing petitions for review of the orders of the National Labor Relations Board.

INVESTIGATORY POWERS

SEC. 11. (a) For the purpose of all hearings and investigations which in the opinion of the Commission are necessary and proper for the exercise of the powers vested in it by this act, the Commission, or its duly authorized agents or agencies, shall at all reasonable times have access to, for the purpose of examination, and the right to copy any evidence of any person being investigated or proceeded against that relates to any matter under investigation or in question. Any member of the Commission shall have power to issue subpoenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence that relates to any matter under investigation or in question, before the Commission, its member, agent, or agency conducting the hearing or investigation. Any member of the Commission, or an

agent or agency designated by the Commission for such purposes, may administer oaths and affirmations, examine witnesses, and receive evidence. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required from any place in the United States or any Territory or possession thereof, at any designated place of hearing.

(b) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpoena issued to any person, any district court of the United States or the United States courts of any Territory or possession, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which the inquiry is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Commission shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission, its member, agent, or agency, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under investigation or in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by said court as a contempt thereof.

(c) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing books, records, correspondence, documents, or other evidence in obedience to the subpoena of the Commission, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

RULES AND REGULATIONS

SEC. 12. The Commission shall have authority from time to time to make, amend, and rescind such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. Such regulations shall be effective 60 days after transmission to the Congress unless the Congress has in the interim amended or nullified such regulations by appropriate legislation or has adjourned within 30 days after the submission of such regulations. Such regulations shall include the procedure for service and amendment of complaints, for intervention in proceedings before the Commission, for the taking of testimony and its reduction to writing, for the modification of the findings or orders prior to the filing of records in court, for the service and return of process and fees of witnesses, and with respect to the seal of the Commission, which shall be judicially noticed, the payment of expenses of members and employees of the Commission, the qualification and disqualification of members and employees and any other matters appropriate in the execution of the provisions of this act.

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

SEC. 13. (a) All contracting agencies of the Government of the United States shall include in all contracts hereafter awarded, negotiated, or renegotiated by them, except such classes of contracts as may be exempted from the scope of this provision by regulation adopted pursuant to section 12 of this act, a provision obligating the contractor not to discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry, and requiring him to include a similar provision in all subcontracts.

(b) No contract shall be awarded or executed by the United States or any agency thereof to any person found by the Commission to have violated any of the provisions of this act or to any firm, corporation, partnership, or association in which such

person has a controlling interest, for a period to be fixed by the Commission not to exceed 3 years from the date when the Commission determines such violation to have occurred. The Commission may by subsequent order, for good cause shown, reduce any period so fixed. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to distribute a list to all agencies of the United States containing the names of such persons.

WILLFUL INTERFERENCE WITH COMMISSION AGENTS

SEC. 14. Any person who shall willfully resist, prevent, impede, or interfere with any member of the Commission or any of its referees, agents, or agencies, in the performance of duties pursuant to this act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

SEPARABILITY CLAUSE

SEC. 15. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the remainder of such act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 16. (1) The term "person" includes one or more individuals, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.

(2) The term "employer" includes any person acting in the interest of any employer, directly or indirectly, and includes the United States and every Territory, insular possession, and agency or instrumentality thereof.

(3) The term "labor union" includes any organization in which employers participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employees concerning the terms or conditions of employment.

(4) Unless otherwise specified, the term "Commission" means the Fair Employment Practice Commission created by section 5 of this act.

(5) The term "Committee" means the Committee on Fair Employment Practice established by Executive Order No. 9346 of May 27, 1943.

(6) The term "commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication among the several States, or between the District of Columbia or any Territory of the United States and any State or other Territory or between any foreign country and any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or within the District of Columbia or any Territory, or between points in the same State but through any other State or Territory or the District of Columbia or any foreign country.

(7) The terms "affecting commerce" means in commerce, or burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce, or having led or tending to lead to a labor dispute burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce.

SEC. 17. This act may be cited as the "Fair Employment Practice Act."

Mr. BANKHEAD subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to make a statement respecting my absence when the vote was had on the question of the immediate consideration of the FEPC bill. I was present at today's session when the Senate convened. I had no information of any kind that a motion would be made to proceed to the consideration of the FEPC bill. I left the Senate Chamber without any suspicion or thought, or suggestion from any source, that the bill would be taken up. In fact, I had heard here that assurances had

been given, not by the Senator who made the motion but by a proponent of the bill, that it would not be taken up today.

I was requested by Mr. Edward O'Neal, the president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, to go to the Raleigh Hotel, where the National Board of Directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation was in session, to confer with that group and advise with them on agricultural measures of very great importance to the farmers. I accepted the invitation, and I was there when the motion was made to take up the FEPC bill. The motion was made at a time when, under the rules of the Senate, it was not debatable, and at a time when it was impossible for me to return to the Senate before the motion was voted upon. That is the reason, Mr. President, for my absence, which, of course, I very greatly regret.

I do not know of any time in the last few years or in the last number of years when I have gone downtown on any occasion or to take lunch anywhere, when the Senate was in session, but that happened, unfortunately, under the circumstances, on this day, and I, of course, very greatly regret my absence. I had no thought or idea at all that this motion would be made under the unusual and extraordinary circumstances under which it was made. If I had been present, of course, I should have voted against the motion, as I am definitely and positively, and to the end, opposed to the passage of this bill.

APPOINTMENT OF FACT-FINDING BOARDS TO INVESTIGATE LABOR DISPUTES—DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. CHAVEZ obtained the floor.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. A few moments ago the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], in referring to his motion to discharge the Committee on Education and Labor from the consideration of certain bills pending before that committee, made the statement that he did not criticize the action of the Committee on Education and Labor; that he did not charge it with any dereliction of duty in regard to the handling of bills pending before it. I wish to thank the Senator for that statement.

Of course, he is absolutely correct in making that statement, because the committee has been extremely active. It has had before it a great many important measures and has spent a great deal of time in hearings and in executive meetings in the consideration of important legislation pending before it. The record is such that his statement to the effect that the committee is not to be charged with any criticism at all in this matter is absolutely correct.

Mr. President, early last fall the committee scheduled hearings on the Ball-Burton-Hatch bill and on the McMahon bill, for October 22, 1945, but when the President announced the calling of the Labor-Management Conference the sponsors of these measures came to me as chairman of the committee and requested

that those hearings be postponed because of the conference which the President had called. After that conference, which was called by the President, had failed, the President himself indicated that he would recommend a course of action for the Congress on this subject.

He did so on December 3, and on December 6 the distinguished Senator from Louisiana introduced a bill carrying out the President's recommendations and the committee immediately called hearings on that bill and is now engaged in conducting hearings on that matter.

Of course, Mr. President, these labor-management problems are of a very serious character, and it would not be advisable to discharge the Committee on Education and Labor from the consideration of these measures and bring this question to the floor of the Senate. It would certainly be an unwise procedure, and probably would result in confusion which would very seriously injure the probabilities of getting sound legislation in this direction.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado and Mr. EASTLAND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield first to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President—

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should very much like to yield to the Senator from Mississippi, but we have a bill pending. The question which the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Mississippi were discussing will not be settled this afternoon.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for half a minute?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I move that Senate bill 101 be recommitted to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BALL. The Senator from New Mexico did not yield to the Senator from Mississippi for that purpose.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GEORGE. When the Senator yields, he yields for any purpose which is legitimate and within the parliamentary rules of the Senate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Possibly that is correct. But I have faith in the Senator from Mississippi. He was having a discussion with the Senator from Montana, and evidently wished to answer the Senator from Montana. I yielded for that purpose, and that purpose only. I did not yield for the purpose of making a motion.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Senator cannot yield for a specific purpose, except for a question directed to himself. When he yields otherwise, he yields for any purpose which is legitimate and parliamentary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The supposition is that the Senator was yielding only for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I withdraw the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion to recommit can be made at any time.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I thank the Chair for that information. I am aware of that fact, but I insist that whenever a Senator yields generally, as the Senator from New Mexico did in this case, he yields for every purpose which is permissible under the parliamentary situation. The Chair has not made a ruling because the Senator from Mississippi has withdrawn his motion; but had the Chair ruled, I should have been compelled to appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

I now ask the Senator from New Mexico to yield to me.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield for a question from the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not wish to ask a question. I wish to make a statement.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield provided that I am not taken off the floor.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not wish to take the Senator off the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to yield to the Senator from Georgia, provided that I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the Senator yielding for a statement, without losing the floor? The Chair hears none.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the action of the Senate in taking up Senate bill 101, the so-called fair employment practice bill, a bill to control and regulate, by state will, the field of human relationships, at a time of crisis such as our country faces today, is notice to the American people that the American Senate has no concept of the responsibility resting upon it.

Not only that, Mr. President. When the Senate met on Monday the distinguished majority leader [Mr. BARKLEY] asked that nothing be done until the President's message was submitted. Many of us were laboring under the definite impression, induced by the action taken at that time, that no controversial matter of any kind would be brought up at this time.

I do not criticize Senators who are pledged to support the FEPC bill for voting as they did. I criticize the Democratic Party for bringing it up under explicit conditions that at least no controversial matter would be presented to the Senate at this time, until the President's message had come before this body.

Mr. President, my party can take whatever course it will, but there are men on this side who are freemen. They will not follow the party will. I wish to serve that notice now. I serve it in all sincerity. If the President of the United States has nothing more important to submit to the American people in a time of industrial crisis, when the very life of this Nation is at stake, then I must say to the President of the United States

that I shall follow the best course my judgment leads me to follow.

Senators may do as they please. It was well known that many of us had been here since the 31st of December, cutting short vacations which we needed badly to work on assigned committee duties and responsibilities. Every Senator understood that no highly controversial matter was to be called up today, or until the President had submitted his message. If this is all that Harry Truman has to offer, God help the Democratic Party in 1946 and 1948.

At a time when the very life of the Nation is at stake we are called upon to consider a bill to compel people in the field of human relationships to do what their judgment directs them not to do. We are called upon to go "Nazi." We are called upon to go totalitarian. I have no quarrel with any Senator who has promised to do it. I know that many Senators have promised, but I have not promised to do it, and I will not do it.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Mexico for yielding to me. I wished to make the record plain that at a time when some of us, at least, are trying to comply with the orders of the Senate itself, a most highly controversial matter is thrown into the Senate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, no one is more devoted than am I to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. I know that he has the respect of every Member of this body. We appreciate his sincerity of purpose, his honesty, and his thinking. It is too bad that once in a while in this body it becomes necessary to differ with those we love. But after all, every Member of the Senate took an oath to do his duty. In this particular circumstance those of us who are sponsoring this legislation and are trying to secure its passage feel that we should take it up in an orderly way and one in keeping with everything which is sacred to the Senate. It is all very well for Senators to say that they were taken by surprise. My good friend the Senator from Mississippi took to task the Senator from Montana because the Committee on Education and Labor—

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not yield now, but I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. EASTLAND. But the Senator is misquoting me.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well; I shall correct it.

As I was just saying, the Senator from Mississippi took to task the Senator from Montana because a bill had not been reported from the Committee on Education and Labor. Very well; how is legislation brought about? A bill is introduced and referred to the appropriate committee. After holding hearings the committee reports the bill, and then action is taken on it by the Senate.

What have we seen lately? Practically every Member of the Senate has been back home and knows what is going on there. He knows the resentment and the complaints because the Congress of the United States is not taking action in regard to legislation which has been submitted to it.

What about Senate bill 101, Mr. President? Is the Senate ready for action on it? It has been on the calendar for some time, having been reported by the committee on May 24, 1945.

Two or three weeks ago the country heard the message of the President of the United States. Regardless of what some Democrats may think, the country heard the President's message, and in it the President called attention to legislation which should be enacted. Among the legislation which the President had in mind was fair-employment-practice legislation, and in simple American words he definitely insisted that the Congress at least consider Senate bill 101, which has for its purpose the adoption of fair-employment practices.

One of the fine characteristics of the American is fair play. So far as Senate bill 101 is concerned, what other legislation of the type or kind which the President of the United States recalled to the mind of Congress and the Nation could the Senate now take up and consider? Is any labor legislation before the Senate? No; it is in committee. Is any minimum wage legislation before the Senate? No; it is in committee. Is any measure relating to the proposed loan to England before the Senate? No; it is in committee. Every other piece of legislation which has been suggested by the President is in committee. But here is a measure which is ready for consideration. Do we wish to waste the time of the Senate? I am in favor of this bill. If the Senate wishes to kill it, well and good. But I object to any maneuvering to keep this body from taking action by voting either "yea" or "nay" on proposed legislation, especially legislation of the character which has been recommended by the President of the United States, which was talked about and endorsed by the late President Roosevelt, which was approved by President Truman, which was discussed by him in his message to the people of the country, and which also was endorsed by both the great political parties of the United States. A year ago in June the Republicans came out point-blank to the effect that "We, the Republicans, are in favor of fair employment practice legislation." Perhaps, some were trying to "cover up." I have some complaints about Democrats, too; and I say God pity the Democratic Senators who now are chairmen of committees unless the Democratic Party keeps itself liberal and votes to enact legislation such as that proposed by the bill providing for the adoption of fair-employment practices. I know that unless we do so, the people will complain, as they will have a right to do, and the people will be resentful, as they will have a right to be, and the people will vote for a change. Unless a majority of the Democratic Members of the Senate vote for this legislation, all these chairmanships, which now are in good hands, will be completely changed. So we see that the question is a two-sided one.

The main point is that fair-employment practices should be adopted in this country. What is wrong with fair-employment practices? We love to talk about liberality and about saving the

world. We sent our boys to Europe, to China, and to the Pacific. The only decoration which thousands of them received was a white cross surmounting a grave. So we should look at the record; we should look at the casualty lists. On them there will be found the name of McGinty, an Irishman; the name of Michael, an Armenian; the name of Levine, a Jew; the name of Chavez, a Mexican; and the names of many others. But, despite that, some persons object to legislation by means of which justice would be done to the relatives of those who paid the supreme sacrifice in the war and generally to the American people who have made so many sacrifices.

So, Mr. President, what is wrong with the fair employment practice bill? The bill does not provide that because a man's name is Levine or Petachelli, he is entitled to a job. However, the bill does provide that a man cannot be kept from having a job because his name is Petachelli, or Garcia, or something else. It is most regrettable that some persons think that it was all well and good to use such men and call upon them to make the supreme sacrifice in foreign fields, to land on a deadly beach at Okinawa or Guam or elsewhere, but that they are not good enough to receive equal treatment in our country. I say to my colleagues that they had better place themselves in the correct position. Those boys did not die in vain. We must make sure that it can never be said that our boys who went all over the world and conquered many other nations in order to achieve freedom and victory, died in vain. The Democratic Party owes them too much, the Congress owes them too much, ever to permit that to be said. Believe me, Mr. President, the American people are fair and just, and they wish to act fairly and justly. There is no reason why the fair employment practices bill should not be enacted. Both parties promised it.

Mr. President, what about those promises? Were they supposed to be made but not to be kept? I went to the convention which was held in Chicago. The Senator from Mississippi and other Senators went to Chicago, each to the convention of his own party. The conventions made pronouncements to the American people and upon the basis of those pronouncements the people had faith in what was promised. They either believed us or they did not believe us. They believed the Democratic Party at the last election and they elected us as their representatives. We have a certain responsibility to perform. When the Democratic Convention acted in Chicago the position it took was good enough for me. On this question I do not think the Democratic Party at Chicago was quite so honest as was the Republican Party. If Senators think that the proposed legislation is political, I assure them that it is not. It is not being offered in the interest of the Democratic Party or in the interest of the Republican Party. It is being offered in the interest of America, and in the interest of fairness and decency. If the Constitution is worth anything, if the Declaration of Independence is worth anything, if the

boys who died on the field of battle did not die in vain, fair-employment practices are correct and necessary.

Mr. President, I will read from the report of the committee on this bill. I ask the Senate to listen to it and then tell me if there is anything wrong with this type of legislation, if there is any reason why all Senators should not vote "yea" or "nay" on the proposition. The report begins as follows:

The Committee on Education and Labor, to whom were referred the bill (S. 101) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry, and the bill (S. 459) to establish a Fair Employment Practice Commission and to aid in eliminating discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry, after holding hearings and giving consideration to the two bills, report favorably on the former of these bills (S. 101) and recommend that it do pass.

After listening for weeks and weeks to testimony both in behalf of and against the bill, an outstanding legislative committee which had been created by this body reported the bill favorably to the Senate.

I continue reading:

Inasmuch as this bill embodies all the objectives of S. 459 and also embodies powers of judicial enforcement and judicial review which the committee considers essential to any effective legislation in this field and which are entirely lacking in S. 459, no separate report on S. 459 is deemed necessary, and the following analysis is limited to the provisions of S. 101.

What is the purpose of the bill?

This bill is designed to eliminate discrimination in all employment relations which fall under the jurisdiction or control of the Federal Government. It forbids discrimination in (a) Federal employment—

Is that fair? There are many governmental agencies in the city of Albuquerque. Is it fair for them to employ Grace Jones and refuse to employ Mary Smith? Is it fair to employ Edna So-and-So and refuse to employ the Antonelli girl? Is it fair to employ a girl who is supposed to be white and of Anglo-Saxon extraction, and not employ a girl who might have a Jewish name?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Not for the moment.

Is it fair, Mr. President, to employ only those who happen to be of one racial extraction? I do not find anything in the Constitution which says that only those whose ancestors happened to be from the British Isles may be Americans. The Constitution says nothing at all like that. I have known some pretty good Americans who were not of British extraction, and when the country was in the midst of an emergency, when the shooting started, we found the Levines, the Gallaghers, the Negroes, the Assyrians, the Jews, and others doing their part in the war effort.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Not at the moment. I am sorry.

Very well, Mr. President, I continue reading:

It forbids discrimination in (a) Federal employment, (b) employment under Government contracts—

Let us say that a large corporation receives a contract from the Federal Government. This bill would prohibit such corporation from being unfair to any person because of race, creed, national origin, or ancestry.

The purposes of the bill are outlined further as follows:

(c) employment in activities affecting interstate or foreign commerce which are subject to Federal control in respect to labor relations. It applies equally to employers and to unions, forbidding discrimination by unions against members, employees, or employers.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield for a question.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. How many persons does the Senator employ in his office?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I employ the full limit.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Does the Senator employ colored help in his office?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not happen to have any colored employees.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Does not the Senator believe that if he employed colored help it would result in the creation of trouble in his office?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not know whether it would or not. However, I may say that I employ Mexicans, Italians, Greeks, and also Jews.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If employers were forced to employ, for example, colored persons and require them to work alongside white persons, does not the Senator believe that it would cause trouble?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not know whether it would or not.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If this bill were enacted into law, I assert that it would cause trouble, and perhaps riots right here in Washington and in other cities.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not believe that it would cause any trouble.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. If I understand correctly the Senator's bill, it provides that no discrimination may be exercised because of race, creed, or color.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. In other words, the bill would provide for a certain number of jobs in this country to be held by persons who were Jews.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It would not do that.

Mr. EASTLAND. It would prevent discrimination against them.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The purpose of the bill is to prevent discrimination. However, the fact that a person who may be a Negro, for example, goes to a factory seeking employment, does not of itself entitle him to a job. All the bill does is to provide that he shall not be turned down merely because he happens to be a Negro.

Mr. EASTLAND. If this bill were enacted into law, the American Government could go to a manufacturer and

tell him that he must give employment to a certain number of Negroes. Am I correct?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; the bill does not contain anything like that at all. The bill would not become effective until after the manufacturer or the union had engaged in acts of discrimination.

Mr. EASTLAND. But the manufacturer would be punished, would he not, if he did not give employment to a Negro?

Mr. CHAVEZ. All the bill provides is that if a Negro, a Jew, or a person of some other racial extraction goes to a manufacturer to seek employment, he may not be turned down because of his color, race, or religion.

Mr. EASTLAND. If the Congress of the United States has authority to say that no person shall be discriminated against in employment because of race, creed, or color, does not the Senator believe that the Congress also has the constitutional authority to say that persons may be discriminated against because of race, creed, or color?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That they may be discriminated against?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not believe so. I do not think that the rights of people can be taken away from them merely because Congress happens to say so. We may create rights under the Constitution, but we cannot deprive anyone of his fundamental rights under the Constitution.

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the Senator refer to the section of the Constitution which provides anything with reference to discrimination because of race, creed, or color?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; the Constitution is definite in the creation of rights. Those rights are enhanced by legislation in order to carry out the purpose of the Constitution. But, as a matter of fact, the rights come from the Constitution. What we do, as Members of the Congress of the United States, must be within the limits of the Constitution.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Senator believe that under the Constitution an employer, as a contractor, has the right to contract with whomever he desires to engage as an employee in his business?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think he has.

Mr. EASTLAND. If that be true, then this bill is unconstitutional.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Why?

Mr. EASTLAND. Because it interferes with the freedom of contract by the employer.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is a question of opinion. I believe so much in the Constitution, I am so devoted to it that I want it to apply to every human in this country. I do not want it to apply only to New Mexico. I want it to apply to New York, to Vermont, and even to Mississippi. I want it to apply there, too.

Mr. EASTLAND. It does apply to Mississippi.

Mr. President, I understood that there would be some Communists—I read it in the Daily Worker—down from New York today, and I see the galleries are infested with them. If this is an American measure, it should be discussed before Americans in the galleries.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is going to be discussed—

Mr. EASTLAND. And not before a group of Communists who come to Washington and attempt to stampede the Senate of the United States into destroying the Constitution of our country.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I do not know the make-up of the guests of this body. I do not know whether they are Communists, Socialists, Mississippi Democrats, or New Mexico Democrats.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I referred to what I saw in the Daily Worker, which is the mouthpiece of the Communists.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not know any Communists, but personally I am becoming tired of hearing men who are merely interested in human beings and in human rights accused of being Communists. In order not to be classed as a Communist, probably one would have to be satisfied with a wage of \$15 or so a month. Then he would not be called a Communist; he would be an American. The guests of the Senate seem to me to have been behaving fairly well. I do not know whether they are on my side or the other side, nor do I care.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like first to ask the Senator from New Mexico whether he does not know that it is customary in some quarters to call a person a Communist if nothing else wrong with him can be found.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. If he disagrees with the name caller.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have been fighting for the so-called underprivileged all my days, because I was one of them. I was reared in that atmosphere, and I am proud of the chance I had in America under the Government of the United States, and I want my fellow beings to have the same chance I had.

Mr. AIKEN. My purpose in rising was to refer to the fact that there seems to be an impression in some places that if the pending bill shall be enacted into law an employer would be required to hire so many Jews, so many Catholics, so many Negroes, so many Irish, according to the proportion of each to the population of the community. I sat in the hearings on this bill for a good many days, and, so far as I know, there is nothing in the bill which requires an employer to hire a certain number of each race according to the population of the community. Does the Senator from New Mexico understand that there is any such requirement in the bill?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will yield as soon as I finish with the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. EASTLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is not provided in the bill, I say to the Senator from Vermont, nor was it contemplated or intended that anyone should be required

to hire only the Gallaghers and forget the others, to hire this one or to hire that one. He is not required to hire anyone. But the bill does provide—and it is what those sponsoring this kind of legislation want—"No; you are not obliged to hire Bill Smith, you are not obliged to hire so-and-so, but you cannot turn him down because of his race, color, religion, or national origin."

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President—

Mr. AIKEN. May I have the floor for just a moment?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand, if the bill shall be enacted into law, and an employer, either a Government employer or a private employer, finds it necessary to reduce his force, he cannot then say, "We are going to get rid of all the Jews first."

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Or, "We are going to get rid of all the Catholics first, we are going to discharge all the Negroes first." Under the bill employers could not do that. I have never found anything in it which says that employers have to hire a certain number of Negroes, a certain number of Jews, or a certain number of Scandinavians.

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator from Vermont contend that if the Congress of the United States has the authority to say a person may not be discriminated against because of race or creed, we have not constitutional authority to say that a person may be discriminated against because of race or creed?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let the Senator bring legislation of that character before the Senate, and, if it is enacted, the Supreme Court will pass upon it.

Mr. EASTLAND. It appears to me that, for those who think, the bill would be the very last thing the Jews or other minority groups in the United States would want. If we can say that they may not be discriminated against, then we have the authority to say that they may be discriminated against; and they are a minority group in this country. Those who think, I judge, would not today desire to go into that field in America.

Mr. AIKEN. Replying to the question of the Senator from Mississippi, I will say that I would not undertake to assume the wisdom of the Supreme Court, myself, if the law we enact is unconstitutional in any part, that body will undoubtedly so decide.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is the Senator's duty to consider the constitutionality of a measure. He held up his hand and swore that he would abide by the Constitution to the best of his judgment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I read further from the report:

A board of five members, to be appointed by the President, with Senate ratification, and to be known as the Fair Employment Practice Commission, is created to administer the act. The Federal courts are empowered, after appropriate judicial hearings, to enforce "cease and desist" orders found to have been properly issued by the Commission.

The progress of the war to date—

This report was submitted before the war ended—

The progress of the war to date has focused world attention on the miracle of American war production, which, despite all obstacles and difficulties, speedily outstripped the war production of all the rest of the world. The United States could not have thus established itself as the "arsenal of democracy" if we had not adopted a national policy of full utilization of manpower without discrimination because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry. We cannot afford to return, after the war, to a situation in which efficient workers are separated from their machines and condemned to unemployment and the manifold social evils which grow out of unemployment merely because of the color of their skin, their religion, or their ancestry. Several States have already enacted legislation to protect minorities within their borders. The Federal Government, in its own sphere, can do no less.

I do not care who gets the credit for passing the bill. I believe so thoroughly in its merits that I would be willing to pass it with Republican votes and let them get the credit. As I have heretofore stated, the bill is not intended to serve the Republican Party or the Democratic Party. It is intended to serve everyone in the United States, to insure justice and fair play. I read further from the report:

The Federal Government must not shirk its responsibility in its own employment policies and in those fields of private employment which are constitutionally subject to Federal control.

S. 101 is designed to promote in peace the same national harmony and efficiency we have achieved in war; to prevent, in the reconversion and postwar readjustment period—

We were trying to get ready before the war ended for the reconversion period—to prevent, in the reconversion and postwar readjustment period, fears and injustices which led to mob violence and race riots in the years following World War I.

In my opinion the committee earned the gratitude and the appreciation of the country for giving time and attention and thought in an attempt to avoid such problems as arose after the last war. Does anyone want race riots in St. Louis? Does anyone want a white man shooting a Negro, or a Negro shooting an Italian, or an Italian shooting someone else? I think it is our duty to pass legislation of such a character as will prevent that kind of condition.

I read further from the report:

To remove a serious obstacle to friendly relations with certain of the United Nations who have long been sensitive to the treatment accorded people of similar origin in this country; to give effect to our declarations for freedom from want and freedom from fear; to raise the standard of living and purchasing power of our people.

Because I happen to have been rather fortunate, and when I go home I have a fairly good meal, or, at any rate, plenty to eat, it does not make me happy to reflect that possibly there are thousands and millions throughout the country who do not have anything to eat. Others may feel happy, others may be content when there are poor people in this country as a result of discrimination. I cannot be contented with such a condition.

It is not American. I read further from the report:

And finally, to confound our enemies who hope by dividing us class by class, race by race, group by group, to vitiate the victory that is at hand and to lay the basis for World War III.

Hitler believed in discrimination. We know what happened. He carried it to its finality. He believed in a superior race. He believed in a superior people and the power of might and dictatorship. I believe in the law. I prefer due process of law to paying tribute to any individual in this country.

I read further from the committee report:

Because we all subscribe to these objectives, it should be possible to approach this problem without political partisanship. The Republican Party, in its 1944 platform, proclaimed—

And this proclamation was made to the citizen who on election day would go to the polls and express his opinion as a free man—

We pledge the establishment by Federal legislation of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Committee.

That, Mr. President, is what the Republican Party said. I am proud of an American like Governor Dewey who took that pledge to heart, and notwithstanding he could contribute nothing to having enacted a Federal law on the subject, he has contributed his share toward establishing a fair employment practice law in the State of New York. He did that, Mr. President. More power to him as an American.

I read further from the committee report.

Its standard bearer, Governor Dewey, in his speech at Buffalo on October 31, 1944, announced:

"We shall establish the Fair Employment Practice Committee as a permanent agency with full legal authority."

Let us now go to our side, the Democratic side. Where did we, the majority, who have the responsibility to the American people at the moment, stand?

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. CHAVEZ. For a question; yes.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator hardly expects, does he, that the Republican Party, which from the days of the War Between the States up to the present time has been a true-hearted friend of the Negro, would take any other position than that taken by Mr. Dewey, as candidate for President of the United States?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not know what were the motives of the members of the Republican Party, but they certainly pledged themselves to the establishment by Federal legislation of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Committee. Let us find out what our side did.

Mr. OVERTON. Before the Senator does that, let me ask him: Is it not passing strange that the Democratic Party, whose strength and whose success in national politics is dependent upon the vote of the South, should take a contrary position?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course, I do not try to approach and analyze this particular matter in that manner. I will say that to me the Negro is incidental, to me the Jew is incidental, to me the Irish are incidental. I am trying to approach the question only from the American point of view. To me it is not a question of racial origin; to me the question is: Are they Americans?

Mr. OVERTON. I will help the Senator approach the question from that point of view.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me so I may ask the Senator from Louisiana a question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Senator from Louisiana think that the Negro voter makes a grave mistake in voting the Democratic ticket?

Mr. OVERTON. I certainly think so. I think that for a short term of political advantage the Negro made a very bad bargain. I think the Negro ought to have stood by, and I think the Negro today ought to stand by, the great party which has been the Negro's friend from the day of the Emancipation Proclamation by Abraham Lincoln up to the present time. I believe the Negro made a mistake when he yielded his friendship for the party which had stood by him through thick and thin in return for the aid which has been given to him during the last few years.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator does not think the Democratic Party is friendly to the Negro, does he?

Mr. OVERTON. Certainly not the backbone of the Democratic Party.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, possibly—

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President—

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have the floor. I refuse to yield at the moment. The fact that the Negro has voted the Democratic Party in the last few elections made it possible to have such Senators as our friends, the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY and Mr. MYERS], our friend the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], our friend the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and Senators from other States. Were it not for the fact that the Negroes voted for them and that the Lucases and the Chavezes and Myers and the Guffeys were elected, so our party became the majority party, I am afraid the chairmanships of the standing committees of the Senate would be found to be in the possession of Senators on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. OVERTON. In other words, if the Senators from doubtful States who required the Negro vote in order that they might be elected to and maintain their seats in the Senate had not pursued the course they followed, the Democratic Party would have remained what it ought to be, the white man's party?

Mr. CHAVEZ. We were the white man's party for many years. From the Civil War up to the time of the election of Cleveland we were a white man's party, but we did not have a President. Then,

as I recall, from 1896 until 1912 we also were a white man's party, but there was a Republican in the White House. The majority of Senators were members of the party on the other side of the Chamber. I am glad the Negroes can vote. Let me say to my friends that if the Negroes are good enough to die for their country, if they are good enough to be allowed to serve their country, to feel in their throats the points of the bayonets thrust by Japanese, and to have their lifeblood gush from their veins as a result, they are good enough to vote.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Mississippi for a question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. I shall have to ask the Senator to excuse me. I wanted to make a statement of two sentences. I asked the Senator if he would yield for a question. I made a mistake. I wanted to make a statement of two sentences. Will the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No, Mr. President. Let me proceed. I want to obtain a vote on this bill quickly. Therefore I wish to proceed.

Mr. EASTLAND. I will say to the Senator that my statement will have no connection whatever with the racial issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Mississippi to make a statement?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No, Mr. President, I do not yield. I feel so deeply concerning the merits of this matter that I do not want to take too much of the Senate's time.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President—

Mr. CHAVEZ. I want to get a vote on the measure possibly this afternoon if I can.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico declines to yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I want the American people to know that this maneuver effectively blocks consideration of antistrike legislation which is so necessary to save our country today.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have stated before, and I will repeat, that this bill has been on the Senate Calendar since May of last year. It is the only measure on which the Senator can vote "yea" or "nay" this afternoon. He could not vote on labor legislation. He could not vote on legislation dealing with demobilization this afternoon. But if he gives us an opportunity, we will get the pending measure out of the way this afternoon, and then I shall join the Senator from Mississippi—

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Senator knows, of course, that there is utterly no chance of a vote being had on this bill this afternoon. It is proposed to move to discharge the Committee on Education and Labor from consideration of a measure, and to take up antistrike legislation immediately, but the present maneuver blocks such action. The

American people should know what is behind this matter.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We can vote today on the pending bill. The Senator from Mississippi can vote against it. We are not trying to delay the matter, but the President called the country's attention to the fact that he had recommended this bill. Defeat it if you must, but it is the only bill on which noses can be counted this afternoon. We are not delaying any other legislation. We are not delaying labor legislation. We are not delaying appropriation bills. But let me say to Senators who are so serious in endeavoring to have passed legislation dealing with strikes we can be counted this afternoon on the pending measure.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to my good friend the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the able Senator from New Mexico. Does not the Senator realize that we have been saved from similar legislation by not going too quickly to a vote? Does not the Senator realize that we were saved—I am speaking now of the South—from the enactment of the antilynching bills which were from time to time so strenuously advocated by presumably a majority of this body, by not going too quickly to a vote? Is it not true that we were also saved from the anti-poll-tax legislation by not going too quickly to a vote? I think I am safe in making the prediction that we will probably be saved from the infliction of the FEPC upon the South, as well as upon the Nation, by not going too quickly to a vote.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so I may ask the Senator from Louisiana one question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I shall be glad to try to answer the question.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator said we were saved from the enactment of the antilynching bill in the thirties. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not correct to say that the South has set its own house in order?

Mr. OVERTON. Absolutely.

Mr. MAYBANK. And that in the last year there was only one unfortunate lynching?

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is absolutely correct in that statement.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am sure my friend the Senator from South Carolina believes that the law should be applicable to all, and that there should be equality under the law. Knowing the Senator from Louisiana and how he feels about the everyday affairs of life, I am confused and surprised to learn that he would like to have one law apply to North Carolina or South Carolina and another law to apply elsewhere. I believe in one law for all of us, applicable everywhere.

Mr. President, I have stated what the Republicans said in their platform, and I have quoted from Governor Dewey's speech at Buffalo.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am sure that the Senator will agree with the Senator from Oregon that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show that on the last day of the last session the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who now has the floor, served notice on the Senate that at the beginning of the next session we would call for action on the FEPC bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. Notice was given on the last day of the session, just a few hours before the Congress adjourned.

Mr. MORSE. I am sure the Senator will agree that there is no basis for criticism of the so-called strategy used today by the proponents of FEPC on the ground that anyone in the Senate has been taken by surprise today. Due and adequate notice was served to those who read the RECORD.

Furthermore, I believe that while the Senate is waiting for the very important message of the President, which we expected on Tuesday and hoped to have today, it is the duty of the Senate to proceed with legislation as important as this. Incidentally, the President should have had his message ready in light of his urging Congress to action on legislation. This FEPC is one of his recommendations and I am ready to vote.

Let me one final comment. If taking up a bill such as this FEPC bill, which goes to the very basic principles of the American Bill of Rights and freedom of free men in America from unfair discrimination in employment, will prevent consideration of antistrike legislation of an antilabor nature, which some Members of Congress are proposing these days—I say that if proceeding with the FEPC bill will prevent the consideration of that type of legislation until the American people have an opportunity fully to apprise themselves as to its dangers to basic American freedoms, then it certainly is very wise for the Senate to take the action which it has on the motion of the Senator from New Mexico. Further, I wish to commend the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] for his nonpartisan discussion of this all-American legislation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the late President Roosevelt was the only man in the short history of this Nation to be elected President four times in free elections. Evidently the American people trusted him. I was not a great believer in the third term or the fourth term, but who am I to stop the American people from doing what they can do under the Constitution if they so desire? How did the late President Roosevelt feel about this matter?

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to give a quotation from the late President Roosevelt. In his speech at Chicago on October 29, 1944, just a few days before the November election he broadcast to the entire country so that on the following Tuesday the people would know just

exactly how he felt on this particular question. At that time he said:

Three years ago, back in 1941, I appointed a Fair Employment Practice Committee to prevent discrimination in war industry and Government employment. The work of that Committee and the results obtained more than justify its creation.

I believe the Congress of the United States should by law make the Committee permanent.

That was candidate Roosevelt, speaking to the American people.

I read further from the report:

It is the hope of the Committee that this unanimity of purpose will make possible the speedy enactment of S. 101. The reconversion period is already upon us. Today the fear of discriminatory discharges weighs heavily upon all who have ever known the bitterness of job discrimination, notably upon the approximately 22,000,000 Catholics, 13,000,000 Negroes, 5,000,000 Jews, 3,000,000 Americans of Mexican or Hispanic origin, 11,000,000 foreign-born, and 23,000,000 children of foreign-born. Each of these groups has contributed heavily to the ranks of our armed forces. Men who were asked to serve this country without regard to race, ancestry, or religion will bitterly resent the denial of peacetime jobs on those grounds.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Under the rules of debate, all I am permitted to do is to ask a question. I should like to ask a question with reference to the statement made by the junior Senator from Oregon, who stated that no Member of the Senate was taken by surprise by this movement today. I do not know whether the Senator realizes it or not, but I wish to ask him if he does not know that many of us—of whom I was one—were assured, from what has always been considered a very reliable source, that no movement would be made to take up this legislation today, but that possibly it might come up next week. The Senator from New Mexico knows that if we had not received that assurance we could have pursued a course whereby his motion to take up the bill would not have been voted on today, or perhaps for a number of days.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the bill is before the Senate, and I wish to discuss it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Louisiana. I ask him who gave him such an assurance.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, there must be some reason for legislation. There must be a motive underlying the creation of opinion or the desire for legislation on a particular subject. Let me read further from the report concerning the need for this legislation:

Contrary to the general impression, unfair discrimination in employment is not the exclusive problem of certain sections of the country. The experience of governmental agencies charged with the responsibility of facilitating all-out war production has demonstrated that there is scarcely any important industrial area of the United States where there is not some form of discrim-

ination sufficient to prevent the full utilization of manpower and the free flow of goods important to the national economy. The President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice has found that only one-fourth of the cases referred to it concerning discrimination against Negroes originate in the 17 States of the South.

Unfair employment practices followed by employers may take the form of complete denial of jobs (certain groups are not even considered for employment), denial of inservice training and upgrading opportunity (the groups discriminated against are confined to the unskilled, lowest-paid jobs), or wage differentials (for example, in the Southwest, Negroes and Americans of Mexican or Hispanic descent are sometimes paid less per hour than Anglo-Americans). Some unions deny membership to certain groups, automatically barring them from closed-shop industries. Other unions bar them from representation on governing bodies and collective-bargaining bodies. Some unions confine their job opportunities, although admitting them to membership, by limiting them to certain departments or crafts. This means that an employer may be ordered by one agency of the Federal Government to bargain collectively with a union that discriminates against a particular racial or religious group, while he is asked by another Federal agency not to tolerate such discrimination. The proposed bill would relieve employers of this impossible position by forbidding such discriminatory practices on the part of unions.

Of course, there is a school of thought which actually believes that this bill is aimed only at the industrialist, the man who operates a large plant. But it applies to all. I do not see why the industrialist, the factory operator, General Motors, or an aircraft company should be by law prevented from discriminating against workmen, while at the same time the unions are allowed to do otherwise. The unions should not be above the law anywhere, any more than should industry, or the average citizen. One of the reasons why I am so strongly in favor of the bill is that it applies to all. It is not partial to any side or to any grade of people.

I read further from the report:

The denial of jobs by employers or by labor unions to qualified workers because of their race, creed, color, or national origin creates an artificial labor shortage in the restricted industries and occupations. This interferes with effective war production and can seriously impede development of our civilian economy after the war. It deprives the Nation of goods and services which might be produced by the minority workers, if their skills were fully utilized. During wartime this has the effect of depriving our fighting men of needed instruments of warfare; during peacetime it creates shortages and artificially inflates prices of scarce commodities.

Employers who are barred from employing the best man for any given job, because of discriminatory union rules or otherwise, are subjected to a serious handicap. On the other hand, from the standpoint of labor, discrimination provides the basis for the economic exploitation of members of minority groups. It results in the payment to the members of these groups of wages which represent less than the full economic value of their services. Thus, discrimination in employment artificially holds down the purchasing power of the members of minority groups. This in turn deprives industry of the full potential market for its products. In many areas, this may represent a major barrier to the healthy economic development of the region.

Discriminatory treatment of minority workers tends to create dissatisfaction and conflict among members of the working force. This interferes with efficient production. The lowering of wages and working conditions and standards, because of the exploitation of minority workers, tends to depress standards for labor as a whole. The use of excluded minority workers as strike-breakers in the past has been a major barrier to labor's progress in achieving improved wages and working conditions. This danger can be avoided only by accepting the members of minority groups on an equal basis with other workers and by providing standard wages and working conditions for them.

Finally, such discrimination burdens communities with added costs for the relief of poverty, disease, and crime which could be avoided if minority workers were permitted to make their full contribution to the production of goods and services and thus to raise their standards of living.

C. THE INTERNATIONAL IMPLICATION OF DISCRIMINATION

Our relations with the people of Latin America today are profoundly affected by the economic discriminations practiced against Americans of Spanish or Mexican descent. As the Honorable Sumner Welles recently declared, "unless these discriminations are obliterated, and obliterated soon, the term 'good-neighbor policy' will lose much of its real meaning."

Mr. President, I care not how many trips our good friend the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSIN] takes to Mexico City. I care not how many trips our good friend the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] takes to Mexico City. I care not how many pronouncements, how many Chapultepec charters, how much political discussion there may be. In the Southwest one can do more harm by discrimination than he can remedy by 100 years of visits to Mexico City or elsewhere.

I continue to read from the committee report:

In the rest of the world, too, our failures to live up to our national professions, proclaimed in our Declaration of Independence and in our Constitution, of equal justice to all, failures which have been magnified by Axis propaganda in recent years, threaten to undermine the position of moral and commercial leadership which the achievements and sacrifices of our people have won in the world.

We are prone to forget, at times, that all peoples have a stake in the war we are waging.

This report was written last May.

I continue to read from it:

Among our allies are millions of non-Caucasian soldiers from the Philippines, China, India, and Africa. The eyes of the world are turned upon us, and the downtrodden people of Europe and Asia with confidence are waiting for our leadership. If we betray this trust, our sons and theirs, a generation hence, may be called upon to fight and die on ravaged battlefields.

At this critical stage of world history, America cannot afford to say to the world that it intends to resume, within its own borders, practices of racial and religious discrimination in employment and still expect its exhortations of equality and freedom of opportunity for all to be received without skepticism by the hundreds of millions of people that constitute the United Nations.

Not only from the standpoint of fairness to those who constitute the minority groups in America, but from the standpoint of fairness to ourselves as a minority in the world community and for the greater safety of our

children and our children's children, it would seem expedient and practical to prove to the entire world that we have the capacity to deal just and amicably with people in our midst without regard to differences of faith and ancestry. The passage of this bill will serve notice that America is in truth the land of equality of opportunity for all races, all creeds, and all ancestries.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent that the last portion of the report, commencing with the heading "Wartime measures" and up to the conclusion of the report, be inserted at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

Mr. BILBO. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BILBO. Let the Senator proceed to read it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know that my friend the Senator from Mississippi is deeply interested in the wisdom and philosophy of this legislation and that he prefers to listen to the report, rather than to read it in the RECORD. So I shall—

Mr. BILBO. I am more concerned than the Senator from New Mexico—

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I object; I have not yielded to the Senator from Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico declines to yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I shall try to show the Senator from Mississippi that everything is fine.

I now continue to read from the report:

D. WARTIME MEASURES

Even before Pearl Harbor, the National Defense Advisory Commission anticipated that discrimination in training and employment would soon prove a formidable barrier to effective use of American power. On August 31, 1940, therefore, it urged that workers should not be discriminated against because of race, creed, color, or national origin. But despite various statements of policy by Federal defense agencies, discriminatory barriers continued to stand between great segments of willing workers and idle machines. In recognition of that fact, on June 25, 1941, the President issued Executive Order 8802, later amended by Executive Order 9346, prohibiting discrimination in Government service and in war industry, and establishing the Committee on Fair Employment Practice. The Committee was directed to receive, investigate, and attempt adjustment of complaints alleging discrimination in violation of the Executive order. It must be borne in mind that the jurisdiction of the Committee has been limited to war industries, Federal employment, and labor unions engaged in war production.

Without statutory powers, and without the ability to rely on judicial enforcement of its orders, the Committee on Fair Employment Practice has not always been able to obtain compliance with its directives. It is the opinion of your committee that a body set up by, and responsible to, the Congress, with enforcement powers subject to judicial supervision, will be able to avoid the pitfalls to which the temporary Executive-order Committee has been exposed.

The policy of nondiscrimination has been enforced, to the extent that it has been enforced at all, by the use of the emergency powers of the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. By and large, compliance has been obtained on an emergency basis by war agencies destined to be abolished when the war ends. The emergency enforcement of this policy in wartime has done much to improve the morale and

the economic welfare of our minority citizens, to stimulate production, and to reduce national expenditures for unemployment relief to a minimum. If this can be done in wartime, it can and should be done in time of peace.

Mr. President, I think that will be all for this afternoon, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to know whether the Senator has agreed or will agree to accept the amendments which were submitted to the bill by the Senator from Minnesota, the Senator from New Jersey, and the Senator from Oregon, on the last day of the first session of this Congress.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I recall that at the time when the amendments were submitted, my inclination was to say "yes." That is still my inclination; but I do not recall the wording of the amendments, so I prefer to wait until they are read.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator.

SALE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT-OWNED MERCHANT VESSELS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'DANIEL in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3603) to provide for the sale of surplus war-built vessels, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. BREWSTER, and Mr. HART conferees on the part of the Senate.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 101) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President—

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I was addressing the Chair before the Senator from Mississippi rose.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I have been recognized.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President—

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, this bill—

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I make a point of order—

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, this bill is manifestly unconstitutional—

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I make the point of order that I was on my feet—

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. MEAD. Well, Mr. President, I can make a point of order; this is still the Senate of the United States.

I make the point of order that I was on my feet and I addressed the Chair while the Senator from Mississippi was still in his seat. The Chair may take me off the floor if he wishes to do so, but I leave it to the judgment of the Chair and to the judgment of the Senate that I was on my feet asking for recognition while the Senator from Mississippi was seated.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from New York is mistaken about that, and I have the floor.

As I was about to say—

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I do not mean to be taken off my feet. I made a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair has only recently come to the Chair, and he is under the impression that the Senator from Mississippi was the first to ask for recognition, and the Chair therefore recognizes the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I wish to commend the occupant of the chair for the operation of his hearing devices. I was on the floor. I was the only Senator asking for recognition at the time.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. MEAD. The Chair may recognize the Senator from Mississippi if he wishes to do so, but I would not want the RECORD to stand in that way, and I would not let it stand if I were in the chair.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, this bill is clearly unconstitutional. It has been stated that the Congress of the United States has the power under the Constitution to prevent discrimination being exercised in employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin. If the Congress has the constitutional power to say that a person may not be discriminated against in employment because he happens to be a Negro, because he happens to be a Jew, or because he happens to be a member of some other minority race, then the Congress has the power to say that he may be discriminated against.

Moreover, if the Congress of the United States says that 10,000 Jewish dry-goods merchants represent a discrimination against the Anglo-Saxon branch of the white race, and if the pending bill is constitutional, then we may limit the number of Jews who may engage in interstate business in this country. It appears to me that with America feeling as she does today, and with the clouds of anti-Semitism rising in this country—and let me say that to deny that fact is merely to stick one's head in the sands and not realize what is going on about us—it would be a mistake to enact into law the pending bill.

Mr. President, I am not anti-Semitic. I am not prejudiced against any race, but I know that the clouds of anti-Semitism are increasing greatly in America, and the Jews of this country who think are the last ones who should support such a measure as the one now pending.

Furthermore, the prejudice against the Negro race of this country is greatly increasing. Every person conversant with the situation know that to be true. If Congress has the authority to say that a

Negro may not be discriminated against in employment, Congress certainly has the authority to say that that Negro may be discriminated against. If we have the authority to go to a shoeshining parlor, for example, which employs more than five or six or seven bootblacks, and say to the proprietor or manager of that shop, "You must employ all Negroes here," it would be a discrimination against the white race. If we have such authority, we have the authority to limit the number of Negroes in this country who may engage in the boot-black business.

The pending bill may be helpful as vote bait in order to obtain some Negro or Jewish votes, but when it is analyzed it will be found that the persons who foster it are not friends of the minority groups of this country.

It has been a recognized right in America since the creation of our Government that under our Constitution an employer has the right to contract in employment with whomever he desires to work for him. That right has been recognized by the courts and by our Government. It is the law of the land. Moreover, Mr. President, it is a recognized and admitted requirement, and a right which an employer must enjoy if we are to have a free government.

Gradually, step by step, we whittle away the rights for which our forefathers fought and died. We are gradually, step by step and day by day, encroaching upon the fundamental rights of human liberty for which our forefathers made great sacrifices.

Mr. President, the right of employment is inviolate. When an employer invests his money for the purpose of operating a business, when he takes a chance, as he must, on earning a profit or suffering financial reverses, it is his business. He certainly has the right to employ whomever he desires for the efficient operation of his business.

It has been said that the pending bill does not interfere with that right, that it merely prevents the employer from discriminating against minority groups because of race, creed, or color. Who is the person who may search into a man's heart and put his finger on the real reason which causes him to reach a decision? Of course, no person may do so.

If this bill is enacted into law a great number of additional Federal agencies will be established and representatives of those agencies will go about the country, drag men away from their businesses, and under this bill take them anywhere in the United States from Oregon to Mississippi, and from the East to the West, should some Federal bureaucrat employed by the agency cite those men under the act. Communism is spreading throughout the world, but it is spreading in the United States to a great extent. The statistics in Russia show that in connection with the income of the people of that country there are just as many and as great discrepancies as there are in this country. In Russia a small minority of the people command a greater percentage of the national income than do the minority groups of the people of the United States, or the select few, in con-

nection with the national income of this country. In Russia the bureaucrats receive the money. They control the power and wealth of Russia. That, Mr. President, is the direction in which we are going in the United States today. We are traveling in the direction of bureaucratic and Nazi control. The pending bill is the greatest step toward the destruction of human liberty and democratic control in America that has ever been proposed for consideration by the Congress.

Before this debate is concluded I shall offer a motion to recommit the bill to the Senate Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. President, what are the facts? Last March the Committee on Education and Labor held hearings for only 3 days on a measure as far-reaching in its effects as is the pending bill. The committee heard testimony from representatives of many Communist front organizations. The Communist front representatives and other radicals of this country were the only ones who appeared before the committee. Not one individual of all the organizations who have protested against the enactment of this bill was permitted to testify.

Mr. President, what are the facts? A man appeared who professed to be a Southerner. His name was Dr. Will Alexander. Again he was known as Dr. Will W. Alexander. He was a member in 1940 of the League of Young Southerners, an organization which I am informed the Dies committee found to be a Communist-front organization. He is one of the directors and one of the movers of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare.

The Southern Conference for Human Welfare is domiciled in Nashville, Tenn., and it professes to speak for the South. The director of that organization, Mr. President, has the typically old southern name of Dombrowski, and Mr. Dombrowski attempts to speak for the people of the South. But Dr. Alexander, who appeared before the committee, is one of the leading figures in the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. I am going to read the facts about that organization as they appeared in the Nashville Banner on July 30 last year. In this paper appears a picture, and over it the following:

Communist Daily Worker comes to Southern Conference for Human Welfare here—and workers seem to follow "line."

Remember, Mr. President, the Southern Conference for Human Welfare is one of the prime movers, one of the prime agitators, behind the enactment of the pending bill. I want to show Senators what company they are in.

Under the picture I find this:

At least one Daily Worker, American mouthpiece of Communism, is delivered daily in Nashville. Its destination is a suite of offices in the staid old Presbyterian Building, 150-52 Fourth Avenue, North, where it comes to the hands of the couple who have given Nashville the honor of being headquarters for the Southern Conference for Human Welfare.

This article is about the two people who are the brains of the above organization with the four-inch, high-sounding title of benevolence. Big names like those of Mrs.

Eleanor Roosevelt or Justice Hugo Black are used for a front on occasion.

Mr. President, I take issue with the statement that Mrs. Roosevelt and Hugo Black are fronts for Communist-front organizations. I do not believe a word of it. But let me proceed:

But the people who do the work and receive the Daily Worker are Margaret Gelders Frantz and one James Dombrowski. Mrs. Frantz is known sometimes as Margaret Gelders or again perhaps as just plain Margie Gelders.

And therein lies the rather interesting story of a girl with a message whose trail or line, as you choose, runs through Radcliff, several Daily Worker stories, various CIO soapbox activities, the Soviet Purchasing Commission—

Think of that, Mr. President, she had been a member of the Soviet Purchasing Commission and came down to speak for the people of the South. I understand this organization and this Dombrowski and this Communist Gelders are heading the movement to defeat the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] this year. But let me go further:

—the Birmingham jail, and finally to the Southern Conference for Human Welfare.

Just a jailbird, just an ordinary criminal, a Communist, and one of the moving spirits behind a bill which could get enough votes in the Senate of the United States to be considered, as this bill did today.

By way of further introduction we might say that Mrs. Frantz is the good right hand of Jim Dombrowski, executive secretary of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare.

And if you do not know the philosophy of Mr. Dombrowski, we might refresh your memory by pointing out that he is the man who, at the recent Race Relations Institute held at Fisk University, said: "The Reconstruction"—

Get this, Mr. President:

"The Reconstruction was a great and glorious period in the South when all people got together and voted for those things that promote the general welfare. * * * The South is on the threshold of another great liberal period."

God forbid that any other people in the world will ever have to suffer as did southern people during the reconstruction era.

Mr. President, I do not believe that right-thinking men, in Congress or out, from any section of America, would let the Communist Party and communism secure a stranglehold on our Government and on the American way of life. Yet, if we enact this bill we go 50 percent down that road.

Mr. President, before I proceed further I wish to say that this bill was called up today, in my judgment, in order to block further consideration of antistrike legislation. I offered a resolution today to discharge the Committee on Education and Labor from further consideration of the President's fact-finding bill and to bring it to the floor for immediate consideration. Under the rules that resolution would have to lie over for a day unless unanimous consent were secured for its immediate consideration. The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] announced that he would object to the consideration of the resolution at this time, and I announced that

I would press for its consideration as soon as possible.

I have read and I know that labor leaders desire that the Congress of the United States be stalemated, tied up for weeks in a fight over the measure now before the Senate, in order to stave off consideration of legislation designed to stop strikes at this, a grave hour in our country's history.

The wheels of industry are stopped. There are strikes on every side. The meat supply, the milk supply, the whole food supply America, are imperiled and the people of all sections and of all classes demand and have demanded of the American Congress that it take action, that it pass legislation to stop strikes, that it pass adequate legislation to do away with the labor racketeer, dethrone Mr. Sidney Hillman and Mr. Philip Murray, and take away from them their control of the American Government.

Congress is ready to act. Congress would rather settle that question, so as to bring back production, to prevent inflation, and to set America on an even keel so that the old "ship of state" could ride out the waves and take us to a more happy and prosperous shore on the other side. That is what the American people want. But here we are, stalemated by a maneuver to prevent the consideration of legislation which would stop strikes, a maneuver which will strengthen the hands of Mr. Murray and the other labor leaders who desire to take their pound of flesh from the American people.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield, if I do not lose the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, the Senator will not lose the floor. The Senator was discussing the labor organizations. I have read the pending bill on occasion with a great deal of care, and have observed that there is nothing in it which would prevent an employer from discriminating against a person because he was or was not a member of a labor union. The bill is supposed to be designed to protect minorities, but there is nothing whatever in the bill which would protect any minority which did not want to be members of a closed shop in an industry.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Even though the labor unions are supporting the bill, they are not willing to afford a fair deal to that minority who might not wish to be members of a labor organization.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is correct, and I say to the Senator that the same unions control the American Government today. I speak frankly and reservedly when I say they control this Government, and that is why, in my judgment, such a provision was not put into the bill. If the desire was to protect minorities, why was it not in the bill? If the bill was to give the man who labors a square deal, why was it not in the bill? Oh, no; communism lives on chaos, communism lives on agitation.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator whether or not he has observed that in section 2 of the bill, in

the high flown phrases with which this very unfair bill is labeled a "Fair employment practice bill," it is said that—The right to work and to seek work without discrimination because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry is declared to be an immunity.

I will ask the Senator whether he has observed that the bill very carefully refrains from saying, "The right to work and seek work without discrimination even though he is not a member of any labor organization."

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is not in the bill. And no person who may belong to that minority is afforded any right whatever under this bill. On the other hand, the tendency of the whole legislation is further to impinge upon the rights of that minority by bringing all persons drawn into industry into the closed shop and the check-off system.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Further, Mr. President, as I said, this bill whittles away the great human right to contract for employment. But it goes further than that. It sets up a commission and permits that Commission to adopt its own rules of procedure, to adopt its own rules of trial. An employer who appears before the Commission is not even afforded the common, ordinary, decencies which are guaranteed in Anglo-Saxon justice. He has no right of cross-examination, if the FEPC wants to deny it. He can be convicted upon hearsay evidence. Affidavits against him can be placed in the record. The Commission can drag him anywhere it desires in the United States. Mr. President, what alarms me more than anything else respecting these movements is the ease with which the Constitution of the United States can be destroyed and human rights whittled away by the Senate of the United States, and it is done under the whiplash of Communist organizations and Communist movements over this country. I say now that more than one-half of the representatives of organizations who appeared before the committee in support of this bill spoke for Communist-front organizations. The moving power in the agitation for the enactment of the legislation is also Communist-front organizations. The American people should know, Mr. President, that Communist-front organizations on this day, the 17th of January 1946, were strong enough to sidetrack antistrike legislation in the United States Senate and to take up the FEPC measure, a bill which would promote bitter controversy throughout the United States.

Mr. President, I do not criticize or condemn any Senator for his vote on this measure, but the moving power, the moving spirit behind this drive for an FEPC is American communism, communism which is directed from Moscow.

What will destroy our country more quickly than anything else is the fact that people in responsible positions who have information, who know things, will slip around and tell about conditions and then swear one to secrecy and say "You cannot use my name. If you tell what I have said people will know where it comes from. That will give me away."

Mr. President, you would be astounded to know how many men in high places in our Government are alarmed at the Communist menace in this country, who are alarmed at the Communist drive directed by those who go underground but operate behind front organizations, and come out with Communist programs. As shown by the supporters of this bill, that is the crowd who appeared before the committee and who have been the driving power in America for a permanent FEPC.

Mr. President, let me tell the Jews, let me tell the Negroes, let me tell the minority groups of this country, that if they will apply reason to this proposal they will find that a permanent FEPC is the very last thing they should desire. If, under the Constitution, the Congress has the right to say that a person cannot be discriminated against because of race, creed, or color, then it has the authority to say that he can be discriminated against. And Congress has the authority, Mr. President, if such reasoning holds true, to limit the number of Negroes or Jews who can engage in any occupation or avocation in the United States. God forbid that such a doctrine, which would result in their persecution, should ever take hold in America. But the foundation is being laid today in the Congress of the United States which would make it possible for another Congress to enact such legislation when the clouds of racial antagonism have become thicker, clouds which are being germinated, which are being created by the same Communist group which is behind this bill, which desires controversy and hatred which would destroy and pull America apart. I say the Jew is the last person who should desire such a program for the reason that as a class the Jews of this country are much wealthier and have more property than have the gentiles as a class. When the Jew and his organizations support measures which will permit discrimination against him, he has sown the seed which can grow and which can destroy him in the future.

Mr. President, I was struck today by the very able address made by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. I love my country much more than I love the Democratic Party. I am not owned or controlled by any party, by any man in public office or by any man in the world. It is my duty to support the Constitution and to support measures which are for the welfare of the American people, and to oppose measures which I deem to be detrimental to the welfare of the people of the United States. I am against this bill and all other measures, whether promoted by the Democratic Party or not, which are not beneficial to my country.

Mr. President, I do not believe President Truman is responsible for this bill being brought up at this time; in my judgment he has done a good job so far. However, if it is President Truman's idea of the measure which should be taken up first in this grave hour, with the wheels of industry locked by strikes, then I think he is ill-advised indeed.

Let me continue with the statement with respect to Mr. Dombrowski:

Mr. Dombrowski's Southern Conference for Human Welfare is the stooge in the South for the President's Fair Employment Practice Committee, the FEPC, which fomented the Philadelphia railway strike that the United States soldiers had to take time out from a world war to settle.

Yes, this is the organization which fomented the strike in the Philadelphia railway, which United States soldiers had to take time out from a world war to settle.

Mr. Dombrowski is the liaison man between the South and the FEPC.

Mr. Dombrowski is typical of those to whom the country would be turned over if we should enact this bill. The bill has a provision which I have never seen in any other bill. It provides that the present employees of the temporary FEPC shall be transferred by law and become employees of the new organization. Time and time again facts have been placed in the RECORD to prove that most of the employees of this organization are Communists.

Senators say that they love their country, and that they wish to bring back the good old days, when men were free in America. Yet they would cast a vote to place a group of Communists on the Federal pay roll, and turn over to them the entire business life of the country. The desire is so great to get Communists on the Federal pay roll that we are asked to do something in this bill which we have never done before, that is, to give certain specified employees a job in the Federal service.

I wish Senators to know what they are doing, in the face of the facts shown by the record. The records of the Dies committee show that a majority of such employees are members of Communist-front organizations. I believe that every reasonable man who loves his country and wishes to do the right thing, when he reads the background and record of the persons whom it is proposed to employ, will reach the conclusion that they are Communists and that they are more interested in bringing on a world revolution, destroying our country, and fomenting racial and religious hatred than in any other thing.

I know intimately most of the Members of the Senate. I know that no men anywhere have a higher sense of honor and fidelity to the principles of Americanism. I cannot see Senators supporting any proposal which would place Communists in control of the business life of our country, and which would make the employers of the country subject to common, ordinary Communists. That is what is proposed. Never before has a bill contained such a provision. The bill provides that a certain group of employees must be the employees of the new organization, the FEPC.

Let me read further with respect to Mr. Dombrowski.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield provided I do not lose the floor. Let me say to the Senator that I expect to be here for 2 weeks, 2 months, or 2 years, if necessary. I will yield for a question, if the Senator

can obtain unanimous consent that I shall not lose the floor.

Mr. CORDON. I wish to place something in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none.

Mr. CORDON. I thank the Senator from Mississippi for his kindness.

(At this point Mr. EASTLAND yielded to Mr. CORDON for the purpose of having several matters printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, which appear under appropriate headings.)

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I am very much humiliated. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] has apparently been very attentive to what I have been saying. I thought he was listening to my speech and agreeing with me, but I see now that he was waiting for an opportunity to place something in the RECORD. I am very much humiliated. [Laughter.]

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. No; I might lose the floor. The Senator can ask me the question next week.

Let us go further with the statement with respect to Mr. Dombrowski:

Mr. Dombrowski is the liaison man between the South and the FEPC. He makes many trips to Washington, and Mrs. Frantz takes care of things while he is gone.

We don't know whether he was in Nashville or the Nation's Capital when the FEPC was struggling for some liquidation money from Congress, but the Southern Conference for Human Welfare picked up about 100 petition signers in our fair city. The plea for this legalized racial agitation agency carried the signatures of ministers, college professors, editors, white and colored, and various intellectuals.

Or perhaps you will better understand the conference when we remind you that through Dombrowski it works hand in glove with various Communist outfits that have found their way to Tennessee.

A number of my good friends on the other side of the aisle and on this side of the aisle have fallen into very bad company by associating with such organizations. For example, there is the Highlander Folk School. That school has been found to be nothing but a Communist organization, which this man Dombrowski, this leader of the South, this spokesman for the people of the South, this self-anointed scion of the old Confederacy, helped to organize. Listen to this:

The Folk School is father of the National Farmers' Union in Tennessee.

I know that in some sections of the West the Farmers' Union is a good organization, but in the South it represents the Communist Party itself. The Communist organizations are all interlocked and tied together behind the drive for the enactment of this bill.

And when the CIO and the PAC have a plan session you can bet your hat Highlander and the Farmers' Union are represented.

Let me say frankly that in my judgment the CIO and the PAC are Communist organizations. I know that there are millions of good loyal Americans who belong to the CIO; but in my judgment

the leadership of that organization is definitely Communistic. It carries the banner for communism in this country. Its leaders are fifth columnists endeavoring to bring about a Communist America. Many of its members are patriotic Americans, but they are subject to the control of radical Communists bent upon the destruction of their country and the enslavement of the men who labor for their living.

NOMINATION OF BRIG. GEN. BUTLER B. MILTONBERGER TO BE CHIEF OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BRANCH

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, with the understanding that he will not lose the floor?

Mr. EASTLAND. If the Senator can obtain unanimous consent that I will not lose the floor, I shall be glad to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, soon after the opening of the session today the President sent to the Senate certain nominations. In the list is the name of a very prominent Nebraskan, about whom I should like to say a few words at this time.

Mr. EASTLAND. How long does the Senator intend to speak?

Mr. BUTLER. For 2 or 3 minutes.

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield, with the understanding that I will not lose the floor.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I am very much gratified with the announcement today of the appointment by the President of Brig. Gen. Butler B. Miltonberger, of North Platte, Nebr., as chief of the National Guard branch. I may say at this point that the mere fact that General Miltonberger's first name is Butler indicates no family connection whatsoever.

I am sure that General Miltonberger's abilities are so well recognized that he will be confirmed unanimously by this body.

General Miltonberger's distinguished career in the National Guard and in the Army during the war just completed justify this appointment.

He has been active in National Guard affairs for 25 years, since he came up through the ranks with the North Platte (Nebr.) National Guard unit. During the war he was advanced rapidly, finally receiving a field promotion to brigadier general, when he was made deputy commander of the Thirty-fifth Division, which included Nebraska's own One Hundred and Thirty-fourth Infantry Regiment. As a combat commander he earned the respect of Regular Army officers, as well as the loyalty and admiration of the troops under him. His new position will give him an opportunity to continue his services to the country and the National Guard in a position of far greater responsibility and influence.

I do not think any of us is inclined to minimize the importance of the role played by the National Guard during the recent conflict. When the threat to our national security appeared on the horizon, the Regular Army was obviously not large enough to handle the job of defending that security while simultaneously inducting, supplying, training,

and welding into a victorious unit the millions of recruits with which it was supplied by the Selective Service System. In accordance with the well-laid plans of the War Department, the National Guard was promptly federalized and thus became a large part of the backbone around which our conquering Army was built. Many individual Guard units likewise distinguished themselves in combat.

General Miltonberger is only one of the military leaders whom Nebraska was privileged to supply during the recent emergency in continuation of the tradition which gave to the Nation General Pershing, our retired General of the Armies. Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, our able and courageous commander in China, is from my home town of Omaha. Lt. Gen. John L. DeWitt, commander of the Fourth Army and the Western Defense Command, was born in Fort Sidney, Nebr.

Maj. Gen. Archer L. Lerch, now military governor of Korea, was formerly Provost Marshal General. Maj. Gen. Harry C. Ingles is now chief of the Signal Corps. Maj. Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, former chief of staff to General Eisenhower, was more recently Gen. Mark Clark's chief of staff. Maj. Gen. Charles H. Corlett distinguished himself in combat in the South Pacific. All these were Nebraska boys, as well as Maj. Gen. Jay L. Benedict, former commander at the West Point Military Academy. I wish I had time to name a few more of our distinguished military leaders, with a word about their achievements.

General Miltonberger's new position with the National Guard Bureau is a key position in view of the expanded place which the National Guard will occupy in our postwar defense system. I am sure all of us can now have confidence that development of our postwar National Guard program is in strong hands and under able leadership.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for yielding to me for the insertion of this statement.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'DANIEL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 101) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I read further from the record with regard to the Southern Conference on Human Welfare:

Also very cooperative—

Speaking of Mr. Dombrowski—
with the Southern Conference for Human Welfare is the Southern Fellowship of Reconciliation which maintains headquarters as fancy as the name out in the heart—

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield if I do not lose the floor.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to move that the Senate now adjourn.

Mr. EASTLAND. That will be satisfactory, provided it is understood that I shall have the floor when the Senate convenes tomorrow.

Mr. McKELLAR. I now move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, that is with the understanding that I shall have the floor when the Senate convenes tomorrow.

Mr. McKELLAR. My motion is made with that understanding; and I now so move.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, before the motion is put, let me say that I wish the American people to know that today, when this FEPC measure has been under consideration, the galleries of the Senate have been full of Communists.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I renew the motion that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 18, 1946, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 17, 1946:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

William S. Tyson, of North Carolina, to be Solicitor of Labor.

WAR DEPARTMENT

Howard C. Petersen, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of War, to which position he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice John J. McCloy, resigned.

GVERNOR OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

William H. Hastie, of the District of Columbia, to be Governor of the Virgin Islands, vice Charles Harwood.

THE TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Byron B. Harlan, of Ohio, to be a judge of The Tax Court of the United States for the unexpired term of 12 years from June 2, 1936, vice Arthur J. Mello.

CHIEF JUDGE, MUNICIPAL COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Hon. Nathan Cayton, of the District of Columbia, to be Chief Judge of the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, vice Hon. William E. Richardson, deceased.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Roy M. Shelbourne, of Kentucky, to be United States district judge for the western district of Kentucky, vice Hon. Shackelford Miller, Jr., elevated.

Edward S. Kampf, of New York, to be United States district judge for the northern district of New York, vice Hon. Frederick H. Bryant, deceased.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

John D. Hill, of Alabama, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Alabama, vice Jim C. Smith, term expired.

Patrick J. Gilmore, Jr., of Alaska, to be United States attorney for division No. 1 of Alaska, vice Lynn J. Gemmill, resigned.

Alexander M. Campbell, of Indiana, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Indiana. (Mr. Campbell is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired December 1, 1945.)

J. Vincent Keogh, of New York, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of New York, vice Miles P. McDonald, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

August Klecka, of Maryland, to be United States marshal for the district of Maryland. (Mr. Klecka is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired October 4, 1944.)

John M. Comeford, of Wisconsin, to be United States marshal for the western district of Wisconsin. (Mr. Comeford is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired October 30, 1945.)

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE

Mrs. Eudochia Bell Smith, of Colorado, to be register of the land office at Denver, Colo., vice Mrs. Jessie M. Gardner, deceased.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Louis T. Rocheleau, of Woonsocket, R. I., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 5, with headquarters at Providence, R. I. (Reappointment.)

CHIEF OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU

Brig. Gen. Butler Buchanan Miltonberger (colonel, Infantry (National Guard of Nebraska), National Guard of the United States), Army of the United States, to be Chief of the National Guard Bureau, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from date of acceptance, and to be major general in the National Guard of the United States, Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 81, National Defense Act, as amended, vice Maj. Gen. John Francis Williams.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be brigadier general

Col. Henry Alfred Byroade (first lieutenant, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Lt. Col. Edwin Joseph McAllister, Infantry, (temporary colonel), with rank from December 11, 1942.

Lt. Col. Arthur Launcelot Moore, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from December 11, 1942.

Maj. George Patrick O'Neill, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1941.

First Lt. Charles Theodore Biswanger, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 11, 1943.

TO FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Capt. Stilson Hilton Smith, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1944.

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

Lt. Col. Clarence Edward Jones, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from December 11, 1942.

First Lt. Thomas Worthington Cooke, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1939.

First Lt. Edison Albert Lynn, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 11, 1943.

TO SIGNAL CORPS

First Lt. Olin Lee Bell, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 11, 1943.

TO INFANTRY

Capt. Harvey Julius Jablonsky, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1944.

First Lt. James Wetherby Graham, Quartermaster Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 11, 1944.

First Lt. Jules David Yates, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 11, 1943.

TO AIR CORPS

Maj. Francis LeRoy Ankenbrandt, Signal Corps (temporary brigadier general), with rank from June 12, 1943.

Capt. Lawrence McIlroy Guyer, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 13, 1939.

Capt. Maurice Monroe Simons, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1945.

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Earle W. Mills, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, effective from the 31st day of December 1945.

The following named officers to be assistant surgeons in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade):

Charles D. Adams	Lloyd H. Klefsatd
Alfred Agrin	John A. Leam
John H. Annegers, Jr.	Gordon V. Lillie
Ernest M. Barker	Joseph T. Lucas, Jr.
Bernard A. L. Bellew	Glenn L. Marshall, Jr.
Frank W. Bussard	Theodore R. Marvin
Joseph P. Cannon	Hugh B. McAdams
George C. Chaney	Hoyt B. Miles, Jr.
James F. Cleary, Jr.	Albert D. Nelson, Jr.
Edward B. Crohn	Leonard R. Ortega
Bernard F. Danton, Jr.	Ralph R. Preston
Francis D. Donahue	Alan Ratfery
Frederick F. Ferguson	Wilfred N. Sanders
Rodes C. Garby	David J. Sanderson
William D. Grant	Clinton R. Strong
Alfred E. Gras	Loy T. Swinehart
Jack M. Gruender	Frank M. Thornburg
Robert L. Henry, Jr.	John A. Twaddle
William L. Hutchinson	Wallace R. Van Den Bosch
William J. Jenkins	Bosch
Carl L. Johnson	Edwin C. Welsh
Edward A. Johnson	Clifford A. Wiethoff
Andrew Johnston	

Lt. Frank L. Lawlor, A (3), United States Naval Reserve, to be a lieutenant in the Navy.
Ensign Ralph G. Leedy, United States Navy, to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy with the rank of ensign.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Maj. Gen. (temporary) Raymond R. Wright, the paymaster general of the Marine Corps, to be the paymaster general of the Marine Corps for a period of 4 years from the first day of February 1946.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 17, 1946

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. McCORMACK.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, the everliving One, while walking the changeful ways of time impress us that whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap. O cry aloud the warning of the prophet: As a man thinketh, so is he. Let us, then, think of the true, of the honorable, and accept the star-high and deep-sea truth as our personal consecration to the realities that cannot die. O God, no matter what the crisis, no matter the perplexity or apparent defeat, may it never be said we failed in following the path of patriotic service. O speak to us in benediction; shield us all with a faith that cannot be shattered; temper us with great convictions that will stand the fire of combat; keep our hearts free from bitterness and our spirits from repining. Soon, ah soon,

let us catch the undertone that assures us of a brighter and a better day. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

GOVERNMENT AGENCIES RESPONSIBLE FOR DISPUTE IN THE MEAT-PACKING INDUSTRY

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, it is to be hoped that the OPA and the Department of Agriculture will take the action required to make possible an early settlement of the dispute in the meat-packing industry. No one in the industry really wanted this strike, and both management and labor know that the single point at issue is an adjustment of meat prices so that the industry can afford to pay its employees higher wages.

The price of all meat products is rigidly controlled by OPA and is held down virtually to the 1939 level. The responsibility for this situation and the responsibility for correcting it is squarely up to the Government.

Since August 1939, fish have increased in price 126 percent; eggs have gone up 102.8 percent; fresh fruits and vegetables have gone up 96 percent; vegetable shortening has increased in price 71 percent; dried prunes have gone up 99 percent—but beef and veal have been permitted to increase only 18.9 percent and pork 28 percent. It is obvious that if prices of food products were in relative balance in 1939, they are far out of balance now, and our difficulties will continue until OPA is willing to face realities and permit a price schedule that bears a realistic relationship to the laws of supply and demand as applied to the food industry.

OPA has never held the line on meat products if the total cost to the people of the United States is considered, but has been able to maintain the fiction of a low price through the subterfuge of paying the meat-packing industry a subsidy of more than one-half billion dollars a year—approximately \$16 for each family in the United States.

The immediate effect of the unnecessary stoppage in packing operations will be to deprive those areas which are most dependent on interstate packers of their meat supplies. The collateral effects will reach into fields such as bakery goods, soap, drugs, and milk.

Here are some of the results of OPA's arbitrary price policies and its failure to act in this crisis:

Meat supplies: Production has stopped chiefly in the large packing houses doing interstate business. Therefore, the effect will be felt most sharply in those States depending to a large extent upon interstate packers. The District of Columbia is at the top of the list in this respect. Figures obtained by the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee during the critical meat shortage

last spring disclose that in 1944 the District of Columbia depended upon interstate packers for approximately 95 percent of its meat supply.

States depending on interstate packers for 50 percent or more of retail meat supplies are the following:

	Percent
District of Columbia.....	95
Rhode Island.....	85
Massachusetts.....	84
New Hampshire.....	84
New York.....	81
New Jersey.....	76
California.....	75
Connecticut.....	71
Illinois.....	69
Pennsylvania.....	63
Maryland.....	62
West Virginia.....	59
Maine.....	58
Delaware.....	56
Missouri.....	55
Minnesota.....	55
Virginia.....	54

Feed supplies: The already tight feed situation will be sharply aggravated. The effect will be felt immediately. Animals which would normally be sent to market will be kept on farms, consuming additional quantities of feed. The most important factor, however, will be the freezing by farmers of feed grains. There is nothing a farmer dreads more than to have animals for which he has no feed and the immediate result will be that farmers will hold onto their grain until they know how long they are going to have to feed the animals they have on hand.

This will cut sharply into the already inadequate commercial supplies of wheat and corn. Corn has been moving to market in relatively large quantities in the past few months but has been far short of demand. The effect of farm freezing of corn will be felt almost immediately. An almost similar situation exists in wheat.

Lard: Bakers and other users of lard will be affected in approximately 2 weeks by any major curtailment in meat slaughtering. Stocks of lard on January 1, 1946, were only 89,700,000 pounds, one of the lowest supplies on record for that date. Supplies a year ago—January 1, 1945—were well over 100,000,000 pounds. The 5-year average for January 1 is 166,400,000 pounds.

Soap: The soap industry depends on meat packers for more than 60 percent of the fats that go into soap. Supplies of fats and oils have been so low that available stocks have been distributed to manufacturers on a quota basis and the industry is limited to a few days' supply. Stocks on hand on October 31, 1945—the latest data available—were 172,000,000 pounds. This compares to 295,000,000 pounds a year previously, which was considered less than an adequate supply. A major curtailment in meat packing will be felt in the soap industry within a few days.

Vitamins and insulin: Packing-house byproducts go into some drugs—chiefly insulin and vitamin preparations. Any major curtailment of supply will have a direct effect on these vital products.

Gelatin: This is also a product of the packing industry and any shortage will cut into the output of ice cream, candy, beer, and other similar products.

Shoes: Shoe manufacturers would feel by spring the effects of any prolonged work stoppage in the packing industry. They will probably not be affected by a short stoppage, since supplies of leather are relatively adequate and it takes from 3 to 6 months to cure hides into leather.

Chickens, eggs, and butter: In many localities—chiefly those depending largely on interstate packers for meat supplies—the work stoppage in the packing plants will sharply curtail available retail supplies of chickens, eggs, and butter. These commodities are distributed in many areas through branches of the large packing companies, so that in addition to curtailing meat supplies, these products also will be affected.

The Department of Agriculture, fearing a surplus of eggs, has already forced feed manufacturers to curtail their supply of poultry feed. This has greatly discouraged the producers of chickens and eggs. Meat-packing firms pack and distribute great quantities of chickens, eggs, and butter. These commodities, already seriously handicapped by arbitrary Government policies, will fail to get to the market—to the great detriment of the consumers and the producers.

Milk: Milk supplies will be affected indirectly by aggravation of the already tight feed situation. In many sections dairymen are already having difficulty obtaining adequate quantities of dairy feed. This will become more serious if feed supplies generally become shorter, and the output of milk is certain to be affected to some extent.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had a special order but was not able to take advantage of it. I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. RANKIN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a letter to Mr. Stuart Symington, head of the Surplus Property Board.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a statement from the national legislative director of the Amvets.

Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Records and include an editorial.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS NOS. 3 AND 4

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, my predecessor, the Honorable D. Lane Powers, signed discharge petitions Nos. 3 and 4. I desire to have my name entered on those petitions and ask unanimous consent that my predecessor's name be removed so that I may sign the said discharge petitions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

BATAAN

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago today American and Filipino fighting men were locked in combat with the invading Japanese hordes on Bataan.

Japanese warships dominated the seas about the Philippines. Japanese planes bombed and strafed almost at will. Japanese supplies were brought in to their troops over well-organized supply routes. The embattled Americans and Filipinos had only a few PT boats as their naval support. Their aircraft could be numbered on the fingers of one hand. There was a dearth of all supplies—from mortars to medicines. They were forced to kill horses and mules. The Filipinos and Americans had only two assets, and these were the spiritual assets of having the goal of freedom for which to fight and the grim, steadfast courage that could know no defeat. It was this courage, this undying devotion to freedom which kept the spark of resistance alive through Bataan, through Corregidor, through the dread march of death and through the long, dark years of Japanese occupation. It was these spiritual assets that hastened the onward march of liberation from Leyte to Luzon. It was these spiritual assets—strengthened by the memory of Bataan—that inspired the unsurpassed achievements of the fighting Filipino guerrillas.

The late President of the Philippine Commonwealth, Manuel Quezon, could well have been thinking of the blood brotherhood of the Americans and Filipinos on Bataan when he said: "By our decision to fight by the side of the United States, by our heroism, we won a battle greater than we lost. Our decision has won for our people real freedom for all time."

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 5 minutes today following the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ARMY RULES AND REGULATIONS

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, there has been a considerable amount of discussion with respect to the rules and regulations, "made work," and things of that kind concerning our boys in the Pacific and in the European area. Here is one regulation which sort of caps the climax. A soldier stationed on one of the small islands way out in the South Pacific, waiting to come home, sent it to me. It is the mimeographed copy of the order.

SALUTING ARMY VEHICLES

All Army vehicles bearing the white star of a general officer will be saluted whether it is occupied by a general or not. The vehicle will be saluted if it passes a soldier on the street or if the vehicle is stationary and the soldier passes it.

The soldier will also salute all officers riding in a vehicle. When saluting, the soldier should turn his head in the direction of the vehicle or officer and look directly at the object of his salute. All salutes should be rendered wholeheartedly with snap and precision in a military manner.

So we have come to the place where men who have been in combat, and are waiting to come home, are not only expected to salute their superior officers, which is of course in order, but also to salute cars and jeeps, whether occupied by an officer or not, and whether going or coming or standing still. And they must do it wholeheartedly with snap and precision. That in my judgment is just about the limit.

Mr. RANKIN. Is that one of the reasons for keeping them over there, and slowing down demobilization?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROGERS of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial which appeared in the Rochester Times-Union of Rochester, N. Y., under date of December 29, 1945.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances and include therein certain statements and excerpts.

MEETING OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO CONSIDER OPA CEILING PRICES ON COTTON

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for recognition in order to make the announcement that Members of the

House and Senate from the cotton areas of the country and others will meet in the caucus room of the House Office Building tomorrow morning to formulate plans for resisting the announced purpose of the OPA to put a ceiling price on cotton, which will represent absolute starvation wages for the workers in the cotton fields.

Mr. TARVER. At what hour will the meeting commence?

Mr. COX. At 10:30 a. m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KILBURN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution.

FIRST TELEVISION NEWSCAST AND VIEWSCAST OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, last night, in company with two of our colleagues, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], I had the unique distinction of appearing on the first radio television news-views cast of Members of Congress. We appeared at the experimental television station 3XWT in the Hotel Harrington, operated by the Allen B. DuMont interests. The newscast was made by our good friend, Mr. Bob Coar, director of the radio room here in the Capitol, and his colleague, Mr. Gordon Graham. I understand that in the near future there will be two weekly news-views casts televised from that station and also that there will be a weekly television forum started very shortly over that station in which Mr. Coar intends to ask other Members of Congress to participate.

Mr. Speaker, of course, this particular experimental program—the first of its kind to originate from the Nation's Capital—was not very widely received here because there are relatively few television receiving sets in our Capital at present, but this program was carried on special lines to New York City where it was retelecast to some 6,000 owners of television receiving sets in our Nation's metropolis. You ask, when can everyone enjoy the delights of television? Well, I made the same inquiry myself after our program last evening, and I was told that it is hoped to have television receiving sets of the table and console models on the market by midsummer in a price range which everyone can afford. By that time regular telecast programs will be originating in Washington for telecast in Washington, Philadelphia, and New York City 7 days a week and, likewise, television programs will be sent from New York and Philadelphia to Washington via the new A. T. & T. coaxial cable. I am informed further that these newly developed coaxial cables—as

they are called—will permit the pipe-line transmission of these telecasts to any radio station in the United States where, in turn, the coaxial cable terminates and they have the transmittal facilities to telecast in their own community. After all, it must be remembered that television is like a searchlight. It does not bend around the earth's circumference. If can only be received where its direct beam hits.

Mr. Speaker, I am frank to say that interesting as it was—and I am sure that my colleagues and I all experienced a feeling of appreciation at being selected for the first news-views telecast out of Washington—nevertheless I must confess it was not too pleasant an experience due to the fact that at this present moment the tremendous amount of heat emanating from the light bulbs necessary for the program—and which feeling I also experienced at the Republican convention in Philadelphia and Chicago—made the experience for my friend, Mr. Brown, most unpleasant physically. However, I am glad to report that because of the recent development of the Orthacon tube and its adaptation to television by Du Mont—in the near future it will be possible for television programs to originate without the use of any artificial lighting which is, at present, so uncomfortable to the participants in the program.

The future possibilities of television are beyond the scope of human imagination. For instance, one of New York's leading department stores plans a morning telecast in which they will show to the housewife coats, beautiful dresses, and intimate wearing apparel displayed in such a way that the housewife may make a purchase merely by phoning the store, giving them the number of the merchandise displayed, her size—and the merchandise will be delivered to her the following day. Meanwhile she continues with her household chores and will no longer have to stand in line to shop—especially at Christmas time to select the gifts for Mary, Charlie, or cousin Sue. Of course, we Congressmen, tired after a day's work here on the Hill, will not have to worry about attending a prize fight, a baseball game, or any other sporting event—or opera—all we will have to do is push the magic button and we will have it in the living room for ourselves and our dinner guests.

But, there is only one thing about this television future that I do not like, Mr. Speaker. When television is installed in this body, as is inevitable, I fear it is going to cause more of us to be on the floor more often. If that be true, how are we going to take care of our committee meetings, requests for personal services, and the correspondence in our offices. Furthermore, for the past 7 years I have been enjoying the privilege of taking off my coat, loosening my necktie and unbuttoning my collar when I deliver my weekly radio talks to my district. As of "tomorrow" we will all more or less be radio actors before the cameras and we will have to preserve our appearance and our decorum but—on the other side of the equation—perhaps that is for the good of our constituents because they will know just what their Congressman looks like, not only what he sounds like, and how he writes his letters. They will

know at first hand what kind of a Congressman they have 365 days in the year.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include therein a letter from a constituent.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances and include some newspaper clippings.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include certain excerpts from hearings before the Dies committee and certain excerpts from the CIO News Bulletin.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a news item quoting the Governor of Virginia in opposition to Federal aid.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a radio script by Lothrop Stoddard of the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a brief editorial from the Springfield (Mo.) Leader.

Mrs. LUCE (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was granted permission to extend her remarks in the Record and include certain excerpts.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after the regular business has been disposed of and any other special orders previously entered, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after the address of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], I may be privileged to speak for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

VETERANS AND SURPLUS PROPERTY

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to bring to your attention a matter which is giving a great deal of concern to every Member of Congress, that is, the miserable treatment our veterans are receiving in their attempts to secure surplus property from the United States Government under the present program.

I have before me a letter with reference to a veteran named M. C. Hankowski. The letter comes from the Smaller War Plants Corporation, and reads as follows:

Subject: M. C. Hankowski.

Concerning your letter dated January 12, the subject veteran was given a certificate, his papers processed and forwarded to RFC, in Boston. Under the procedure SWPC can do nothing more, it being the responsibility of RFC to notify the veteran if and when the truck he desires becomes available.

For your information, the last trucks sold to veterans were at the sale held at Fort Devens October 2 to 12, inclusive, under the direction of the Department of Commerce. Since that time no trucks, to our knowledge, have been sold to veterans. We have processed, during the period, certificates for approximately 500 trucks, but for some unknown reason veterans are unable to get them.

We have veterans calling at this office daily who have been to Boston calling on RFC, Consumer Goods Division, 600 Washington Street—the office that handles the disposal of trucks for this area—but all of them return very much disgusted and some of them express themselves in no uncertain terms as to the methods employed to waste both time and money.

SWPC has used every means available but, as indicated above, without tangible result. If there is something that your office can do to alleviate this situation, I am sure that it would be appreciated by all concerned.

Very truly yours.

I call upon my colleagues to do something about this matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I believe my colleagues in the House would like to know that your Committee on Labor, through general agreement of its members reached a few minutes ago, will make a definite decision on either Monday or Tuesday of next week in reference to the fact-finding proposal, which is in legislative form as a bill, pending before the Committee on Labor.

The membership of that committee feels very deeply, as expressed at this morning's session, its individual and collective responsibility to act expeditiously and courageously in connection with these employee-management problems.

I believe this explanation, not so much an explanation but a statement to the Members of this body, is in order today in view of the acute strike situation.

Mr. Speaker, I now ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor be permitted to meet during the session of the House this afternoon, and if the House is in session tomorrow afternoon that we be permitted to meet during that session also.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, I wish to clarify the statement of the gentleman from West Virginia, if I may. Do I understand the gentleman to say that he is going to bring a bill on the floor of the House next week?

Mr. RANDOLPH. It is my opinion, and I can speak only in a personal way, that next Monday or Tuesday the committee will actually vote up or down the

principle embodied in the President's fact-finding proposal or a substitute or an enlargement of that measure.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I believe the chairman of our committee might well have added that all the Republican members of that committee except one, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BALDWIN], were present this morning; that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] offered a motion that we amend the Norton bill, which is the fact-finding bill, by striking that section which refers to section 11 of the National Labor Relations Act which authorized the members of this committee if it is created to subpoena books, records, and witnesses—we offered an amendment taking away that power, and also striking out that provision of the bill which called for a waiting period. The motion included a provision that the chairman of the committee should apply to the Rules Committee for an open rule bringing the bill on the floor, that they should report the bill, and we lost out there. All six of the Republicans and one gentleman from the other side voted in favor of it but by use of a proxy it was finally a tie vote. I am correct, am I not?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman from Michigan in general and even in particular—

Mr. HOFFMAN. And in particular too.

Mr. RANDOLPH. My colleague has supplemented the statement I have just made.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, this is merely to find facts, it is the fact-finding bill, is it not?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I explained the committee expects to take action on the fact-finding bill. The members may act on that legislation or substitute another measure.

Mr. RANKIN. But a bill merely to find out facts.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I could not confine it to that scope because I believe the membership of the committee—I can only speak as I feel—expressed this morning desires to take necessary action.

Mr. RANKIN. When do you expect it to reach the floor?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask whether legislation is going to come out of the gentleman's committee now since he has resigned as mayor of the city and is going to take up this legislation—and the gentleman did a good job while he was mayor—I want to know whether the gentleman as chairman of the committee is going to be able to bring legislation out of the Committee on Labor that will give the people of this country, whether they be workers or employers, the same rights and responsibilities and the same punishment for failing to live up to their agreements.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman from Pennsylvania I hope will accept my statement when I say I believe in equal treatment under the law.

Mr. RICH. Under the law. But the trouble is our law is lopsided now. We do not want that; we want to get a law that will give equal rights, impose equal

responsibilities, and meet out equal punishment to employer and employee. That is what we want.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman from West Virginia can agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the employee and the employer should be treated alike under the law whether it is now in effect or whether the Labor Committee recommends to this body, and we ultimately pass, some new measure dealing with these problems.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman is still getting away from that and I do not want him to get away from it. The law now is such that it gives labor certain rights today under laws that we have passed in the last 12 years which are detrimental to this country. Just look at what is happening all over the United States now. The people of this country are sick and tired and bewildered. We want to maintain this form of Government of ours, we want to maintain an attitude of honesty to all the people; we do not want these labor racketeers around trying to destroy America and bringing communism in here. That is the ultimate object of the labor leaders today and we do not want that.

Mr. RANDOLPH. In reply to the observation of my friend from Pennsylvania, I desire to state to my colleague that I believe in the right of labor to legitimately strike. I do, however, supplement that statement by saying—I hope I am wrong, but I feel I am right—we are seeing in the United States today more than a series of strikes. We are seeing a certain pattern followed which I am fearful is instigated and led by many persons within labor, within management, and within Government who desire ultimately Government ownership, not only of the public services and utilities of this country but general commercial and business enterprises as well.

I am fearful that responsible unionism suddenly will awaken to find a considerable segment within labor, management, and Government using economic unrest as a guise for further direction and control from Washington. I fear there is a subtle but nevertheless strong movement to force Federal Government control of business.

We have fought for adequate wages and improved working conditions and these have been attained within the framework of our free bargaining and legislative system. Now we must guard against those individuals and groups who would attempt to antagonize employee and management relationships to such an extent that the domination of our industrial pattern and our free enterprise activity would be entirely dependent on the Federal Government. Certainly sound labor leaders as well as private business representatives realize this would mean Government ownership, not only of public utilities but virtually every form of commercial undertaking.

These immediate postwar conditions must be met courageously with the spirit of cooperation. The grocer who has no goods on the shelves to supply eager customers would soon be forced to close his store, and it follows that if we have a prolonged period of nonproduction of

essential consumer goods, this country, instead of enjoying a period of peacetime prosperity, will become barren and depressed. Many of us are fearful that this period is not far distant.

Mr. Speaker, I favor the principle embodied in the fact-finding bill. President Truman's proposal is meritorious. Fact-finding boards, especially during reconversion, would implement, and not destroy, collective bargaining. I believe in labor's right to strike in peacetime. I feel, however, postponing of individual strikes during determination of labor-management disputes is desirable so the public interest is provided for by continuing the production of essential consumer goods. Hard-won gains for responsible unionism and loyal labor must be preserved. I feel, however, the objectives embraced within H. R. 4908 would not destroy, but might well reinforce, voluntary mediation and sanctification of contract. I can conceive that the law's operation should be for the reconversion emergency only. If it worked well, labor, management, and Government might cooperatively desire its permanency.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to say that the Rules Committee is not going to transgress upon the prerogatives of any other committee of this House; but I am confident, on the other hand, that that committee wants to be used in such manner as the House may see fit in order to save this country. It is my understanding that the Rules Committee has jurisdiction of a bill from the moment it is dropped in the hopper and that it is within its power to report to the House resolutions discharging legislative committees from the further consideration of bills pending before the committee and submitting the entire matter for consideration in the House. I make this observation in order that the membership may understand that in cases where committees sit down and refuse to act there is a means available of bringing the measure before the House.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I was listening for the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], a member of the Rules Committee, giving assurance to the House that whatever bill is reported would not come in under a closed rule.

Henry Thomas Buckley, one of the greatest political philosophers in history, said that the great reforms of the English-speaking race "have consisted in not doing something new but in doing something old."

If you want to get America back to where it should be you are going to have to repeal or drastically amend the Wagner Act, the Wages and Hours Act, and the Walsh-Healey Act. There is no use whipping the devil around the stump. You are not going to get anywhere hunting facts. We know the trouble now, we know the facts now. The Congress is responsible for the passage of those laws and for the threat of revolution that is rearing its horrid head all over the Nation today as a result of those unfortunate measures.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object,

for the sake of trying to straighten out the record on a few points, may I say in the first place that from the very beginning I have been publicly in support of the President's proposal for the establishment of fact-finding bodies. I flatly disagree with the statement of any Member that the appointment of those bodies will be of little effect. Indeed, I believe they are the fundamental approach to a solution of this problem, and I believe that primarily if once one of those fact-finding bodies has made its findings, the membership of this House and every other person with a capacity to influence American public opinion will stand up and be counted in defense of an impartial proposal for a settlement of these disputes.

To my mind, the real root of this difficulty is not a desire, as has been charged, on the part of labor to introduce communism in America, which I do not believe is a fair charge against more than a tiny fraction of the population of this country, but is rather to be found in a spirit which pervades a great many elements of the population today which refuses to put the national interest paramount over the particular interest of any special group, and I believe that is to be found in the ranks of management and corporations quite as much as it is found in the ranks of labor. Indeed, I think unwisdom on the part of Congress in precipitously repealing the excess-profits tax contributes to the trouble we are in today. I believe that trouble has got to be solved. I think it will require action by the Congress, and I am prepared to take that action; but unless that action is postulated on a fair and just appraisal of the fact that selfishness exists every place, and of a true attempt to put the national interest paramount over all, we shall fail in our attempt. I honestly believe that the gentleman's committee is going to do a good job, and when they bring in legislation, I hope it will be such that the membership may support it in overwhelming number.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, with an unprecedented number of strikes now under way and in prospect, and with the country and the President looking to Congress for action, it seems very unfortunate to me that the Labor Committee this morning should devote its time to the consideration of a relatively inconsequential bill; certainly inconsequential at this time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I congratulate the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] upon his remarks that his aims are to bring in a fair bill. I know that if such is the case, there will be no trouble whatsoever to obtain speedy action on the part of the Committee on Rules, so I hope that the request of our acting Labor Committee chairman for unanimous consent that his committee might be able to continue its hearings and deliberations on this important legislation will not be objected to, so that the Committee on Labor might be able to report legislation that he favors, and I hope that that committee will recommend legislation—not labor-baiting or union-destruction legislation, but legislation that will be fair to industry, fair

to labor, and in the interest of our country.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have been receiving letters from members of the meat packing union, and this is a sample of those letters:

I learned last Saturday from certain workers, due to my direct contact with labor in the city of Chicago, that they are being called out on a meat strike and that they are very much worried about it. They are against the strike, are satisfied as things are, and cannot understand why they are being called out. This statement was unanimous, "We were forced to join the union against our will, in order to be able to work, and we are also being called out on strike against our will."

It must be that there is a communistic element in the high places along the line that is causing these things. Cannot something be done?

With kind personal regards, I am,
Yours truly,

Mr. Speaker, I would never question the patriotism of the gentleman from Virginia who is now speaking, but I regard much of the fact-finding suggestion as socialistic. I look upon the gentleman as one of our patriotic leaders. I know of his fight against communism. I think he will fight any socialistic tendencies in this country.

Mr. SAVAGE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, we know there is a great deal of industrial disturbance that needs some attention and should be solved, but I think, above all, Congressmen should not approach it from an emotional basis. This is something serious that we should consider with good, cool judgment. The charge made that this is all communism, that labor is all Communist, is certainly an unfair charge against labor. The vast majority of American people belong to families that are headed by laboring men. Another thing to take into consideration is that we do not need to get too upset right now because right today there are more men on the job than there have ever been in peacetime in the history of America. There are a few on strike, very few, compared to those that are working. I think the committee should have the right to consider this question and come forward with some good recommendations, but not with the idea of crushing labor, either. If, as was suggested a few moments ago, we take everything away that labor has gained, that is the way you will cultivate communism in this country. If you want communism, that is the best kind of a campaign to get it. Crush them down and make them interested in something that will overthrow what we have. You have to help labor, not crush it.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. RICH. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has been very liberal, and the Chair does not want to restrict debate, but the Chair does not like to see a Member reserve the right to object on more than one occasion.

Mr. RICH. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. If a Member makes a statement here that someone says that all labor is communistic, whom does he accuse? If so, what penalty is there for a Member of Congress making such a statement as that?

Mr. SAVAGE. I did not mention any name, but if it will fit any shoe—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In answer to the parliamentary inquiry, the Chair thinks the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is sufficiently conversant with the rules to answer his parliamentary inquiry himself. However, the Chair will state that the gentleman from Washington is expressing his own opinion and is clearly within his rights. Whether he is right or not is another question.

Mr. RICH. I inferred from his talk that he stated that someone in the House said that all labor is communistic.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is not responsible for the inferences the gentleman from Pennsylvania may draw.

Mr. RICH. If he accuses somebody of that, we ought to find out who that fellow is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has already answered the gentleman's parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. RICH. I do not think the Chair has answered that inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The regular order has been demanded.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, in view of the request and statement I made, and also the numerous reservations which were made, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks to give my opinion on the fact-finding proposal and also other views that I hold in reference to this subject matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial from the Bristol Courier of Tuesday, January 15, entitled "Health and Plunder."

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include a letter.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HOFFMAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

LABOR SITUATION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the colloquy that has just taken place is very revealing. To sum it up, what has happened in the Committee on Labor is what has been anticipated by the vast majority of the Members of the House. The motion that was before that committee, it seems, was a motion to extract all the little milk teeth that were in the President's proposal and then report out something that amounted to a little more than the title to the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I decline to be interrupted at this time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In view of the fact that you were talking about milk teeth, I want to know if you are in support of taking even those out.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the time has come when the House might just as well quit stalling around with the Committee on Labor and the House might just as well make up its mind that this country knows the score. The people know that Congress is not acting on these matters. My mail indicates an overwhelming desire on the part of the people that Congress should at least try to do something about a situation that is becoming so disastrous.

Ever since the enactment of the one-sided National Labor Relations Act, the country has been gradually drifting toward a crisis that will determine whether the Government is to be run by, for, and of all of the people, or by and for a handful of ambitious, power-drunk labor leaders. Early in this struggle I took my stand in opposition to the threatened labor dictatorship, and in retaliation these groups have repeatedly sought with every weapon at their command to eliminate me from public life.

Since the end of the war, we have reached that crisis. The CIO and its Political Action Committee have declared open warfare on every public official from the President of the United States down who dares, in the slightest degree, to suggest a curtailment of their powers to dominate the Nation.

In recent weeks we have seen preliminary demonstrations and warnings of their power to close down and cut off every essential industry and enterprise upon which the Nation depends for food, fuel, transportation, communications, and other necessities of modern life.

This handful of labor barons by a series of short work stoppages, have merely served notice in unmistakable fashion that with a few dominant labor leaders in strategic industries lies the power to freeze and starve 140,000,000 of supposedly free American citizens.

This statement will be said to be a gross exaggeration, but stop and think back over the past few weeks.

With the first blasts of winter came a sudden and rather mysterious coal strike. The production of fuel for heat and power suddenly ceased. Frantic but feeble and ineffectual efforts of your Government to avert a national catastrophe were utterly ineffective, until,

with a magic and majestic wave of the hand, the lord of all the coal miners ordered them to return to work. The strike ended as abruptly as it had begun.

No one man or group of men should have the power in a free country to freeze the American people.

Then came a wave of strikes in the trucking and bus service throughout the Nation, suddenly called under the leadership of one man. Returning soldiers could not get to their homes. Towns isolated from railway systems began to feel the pinch of hunger. Government intervention and petitions were unavailing until the heads of the unions graciously and of their free will again permitted the commerce of the Nation to flow.

No one man or group should have the power to starve the American people or inhibit their freedom of movement.

Then, not to be outdone, the little dictator of the automobile industry decreed that the American people should have no automobiles until that industry agreed to accept his communistic demand that his subjects be permitted to share the profits of the industry on the basis of the wealth of the employer, instead of on the services performed. The people, whose worn-out automobiles after 4 years were going to the junk pile by the thousands, must wait in futile patience upon the lordly grace of another dictator.

No one man or group should have the autocratic power to return the American people to the "horse and buggy" days.

And then we suddenly find our telephones dead and our telegraphic system has ceased to operate, and our whole communications system becomes paralyzed to the amazing and disgraceful point where high executives of the Nation must plead in pitiful impotence with the dictators of these unions to be permitted to transmit vital official communications of the utmost importance to the Nation.

While this is going on, your Government is actually being bludgeoned into averting the catastrophe of a Nation-wide strike in the steel industry by buying off the dictators of the steel workers' union with an inflationary rise in the price of steel products to the American people.

At the same time, frantic and humiliating efforts are being made by the Government to avert a Nation-wide strike in the meat-packing industry, and it is actually proposed to buy off this strike by a subsidy to the meat packers to be passed on to the union in the form of increased wages, and paid out of the sweat and toil of 140,000,000 American taxpayers.

Is it possible that this Government has come to such a low estate that it must buy off every little group of labor dictators who threaten to halt the operation of any essential function of our economy? The answer lies with the Congress. Is a seat in this body so dear to any Member that he would sacrifice every vestige of freedom and liberty and every right of the masses of his people to retain the tolerance and support of a minority group that is seeking to cut away the very foundations of democracy?

Oh, some will say "well, the air is still free." Oh, no. We still have James Caesar Petrillo.

Petrillo is the president of the musicians' union. He exercises probably the most complete dictatorial system of peonage over his members of any labor union in the country, and through use of the boycott system, absolutely and completely controls the air waves and what programs may go out over the radio, and what the American people may listen to over the air. Any radio station that disobeys his command is boycotted and not permitted the services of any member of the union or any union-made transcription. He can and has defied successfully both the Federal Communications Commission and the President of the United States. He issued a decree levying a tax on all transcribed music, which requires radio stations to pay a fixed sum on each transcribed musical record sent out over the air. He not only levied the tax, but he made it stick, and collects. Of course, this is hard to believe, but it is a well-known fact. He has prohibited American school children bands from giving free concerts over the air and he has made that stick and enforced it. Under existing Federal law, he has actually prohibited the Army and Navy Bands from giving free entertainment to people whose taxes pay them. When the Nation was celebrating the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of George Washington, the community in which he lived held a celebration on the two hundredth birthday of the father of the country. At their request, I asked for a section of the Army Band to play at this entertainment and was astonished to find that the Army could not issue the order without consent of James Caesar Petrillo. The permission was refused and the celebration on the birthday of the first Commander in Chief of the Army had to be conducted without the presence of the Army Band.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I would rather not.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. For a very brief observation: That when the battleship *South Dakota* was commissioned at Philadelphia an attempt to have the high-school band of the State of South Dakota play at the commissioning of the ship was objected to by James Caesar Petrillo on the same basis.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. There are thousands of those instances that come to the attention of the Congress, yet we sit around here and do nothing. Now, what are you going to do about it? It is going to go on just like it has gone on until the people of this country get so thoroughly sick, tired, and disgusted with this monkey business that they are going to make us do something about it.

Last Armistice Day, ceremonies were held in the city of Fredericksburg near the Quantico Marine Base in commemoration of the heroes who gave their lives in the First and Second World Wars. A request was made that the Marine Band be permitted to play at that ceremony in commemoration of their fallen comrades. Again the request was submitted to James Caesar Petrillo, president of the musicians union, and again it was denied. And the memorial services

had to proceed without the presence of the Marine Band.

More recently, Petrillo has extended his dictatorship over the American people into international fields. He has now issued an order prohibiting any musical broadcasts to come over the air through American radio stations that originate in foreign countries. I am informed upon the most reliable authority that the broadcasting companies have now been compelled to suspend their preparation for the extension of television, because of the dictatorial interference of Petrillo with their operations.

I state these facts in as few and simple words as possible, because the mere statement of facts which cannot be refuted and are well known to many people, both in and out of Congress, ought to be sufficient to arouse the Congress to enact some definite legislation. All of these abuses are permitted, condoned, connived at, and often abetted by existing law enacted by the Congress. The failure of Congress to correct this situation will, in the public mind, make Congress as blameworthy as the Petrillos and others who perpetrate these outrages under the shield and protection of laws which the Congress itself enacted.

Oh, say does that star-spangled banner still wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave?

Today the American people can well pose that question to themselves and to their Congress and to the two great political parties that shape our destinies. The most fundamental freedom of man is the right to work and to earn a living for his family—when, where, and how he wishes—without dictation, fear, or interference from any source. That freedom was first enunciated in the Biblical injunction, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread," and has remained the guiding rule of human endeavor through all the progress of civilization, until the political dictation of organized labor challenged the freedom of the individual to work and now challenges the power of government to enforce that right.

The revolutionary strategy adopted by a few dictatorial labor leaders under color of rights acquired through legislation enacted by the Congress has not only denied to individuals the right to work and feed their families, but now denies to the whole American people the production and distribution of those commodities essential to supply their needs for food, clothing, fuel, and necessary services. Congress, through legislation that has placed unscrupulous labor leaders on a pedestal above other citizens, has created this Frankenstein that threatens now to destroy our economy when reconversion to civilian production is a paramount need of all the people.

Will Congress act courageously to correct the abuses which have grown up under the labor laws it created? Or will it cringe and crouch under the tongue-lashings and intemperate abuses of such blustering, blundering bullies as Philip Murray, Walter Reuther, James Caesar Petrillo, and the like?

The challenge is to Congress to answer the question whether America is still the "land of the free and the home of the brave." After long years of patience and appeasement, the President has sent to Congress a message urging immediate legislation to set up a mild and insipid system of mediation and persuasion to allay the strikes that threaten the whole economy, peace, and comfort of all the people of the United States. He makes but one request of organized labor, and that is that it cooperate with its Government to the end that workers may be permitted to continue to work and feed their families and supply essential goods to the general public while the Government seeks a solution and settlement of labor disputes. Can anyone with a scintilla of respect for the paramount public rights find any fault with that proposal?

The President specifically asked Congress to go no further than the Railway Labor Act, which has worked successfully for 20 years in the interest of labor, employers, and the public, and yet this mild proposal—and the President of the United States who makes it—are attacked by our labor dictators with as much vehemence and intemperance as if the President had demanded the repeal of all protective labor laws.

These labor dictators who have been permitted unrestrained to run roughshod over the rights of the American people and to ignore the superior interests of the public have the audacity to hurl their epithets and vituperation at the President of these United States because he has the courage to remind them that the rights of the whole people are superior to the dictates of any minority group, even if it bears the brand of organized labor. They do not object so much to the President's proposal as to the fact that organized Government now challenges organized labor. They know that their boasted political power is 90 percent bluff and bluster. They live in constant fear that an administration interested primarily in the welfare of the Nation as a whole will call that bluff—and when that is done, they know that the overwhelming public opinion of the country will uphold the President and let that approval be known in no uncertain terms.

The President's proposal goes little further than the War Labor Disputes Act—commonly known as the Connally-Smith Act—which provides for a cooling-off period of 30 days before a strike can be lawfully called. It is subject to the same specious criticism that it legalizes strikes after the 30-day period has expired. The same criticism can be leveled with equal force against the Railway Labor Act.

What the American people are looking for, hoping for, and expecting is a law with enough teeth in it to end lawless, revolutionary acts in the conduct of strikes and labor disputes. The public will not be satisfied with innocuous and ineffective legislation that serves only to arouse the ire and resentment of the labor barons, without accomplishing the needed results.

The President recommends, but Congress legislates. Will Congress do so effectively, or merely give lip service to the public need in this time of crisis?

In the bill H. R. 4875, which I introduced the day the President sent his message to Congress, I make definite proposals for legislation that is not repressive and will not impair any lawful or proper right of organized labor, or interfere with the collective-bargaining rights of wage earners. They are the same proposals that passed this House by a large majority in December 1941. They will very definitely curtail the pomp and power of the few labor dictators who fatten upon the continual agitation that they constantly foment. I present these definite proposals for legislation, and will discuss them in detail.

First. We should include the President's recommendation for a provision similar to the Railway Labor Act providing for mediation and conciliation of labor disputes, with strikes and lock-outs barred during the limited period of negotiation.

Second. There should be a provision that would make unions and companies equally responsible under any contract mutually arrived at through the process of collective bargaining.

Third. There should be provisions to protect both workers and companies from the violence, intimidation, and threats so prevalent and effective in compelling workers to remain idle against their wills.

Fourth. There should be a rigid prohibition against sympathy strikes, boycotts, and jurisdictional strikes.

Fifth. The term "employee" should be defined to exclude the organization into unions of supervisory and managerial employees of the employer to whom he looks to carry on the management of the business.

Within these limitations, the right to cease work or to strike should be protected and the principle of free collective bargaining between employer and employees should be preserved.

I realize that these proposals will meet with violent objections and lurid expressions of distaste on the part of those few labor leaders who have been led to believe that they have a vested ownership in the worker and in the fruits of his labor. They cannot be brought to agree to these proposals, because they will interfere with the dictatorial control which they now exercise over labor, industry, Government, and the American people.

Take the first proposal—that of the President for a cooling-off period of 30 days before a strike. It has been attacked by the instigators of the General Motors strike in terms that charge the President with shaking the very foundations of democracy. It has been called "antilabor" on the floor of the House of Representatives. Legislators who have defended the proposal are branded as labor baiters. And yet all the President proposed was to adapt the provisions of the Railway Labor Act to labor disputes in industries which are as essential if not more essential to the public welfare and convenience as the railway transportation system.

Whatever may be said for or against the Railway Labor Act, certainly there has been no demand for its repeal or amendment, and in 20 years' operation it has served to protect the public against

strikes in the railway transportation field. Had the President desired to go further in paralleling the Railway Labor Act he might have well asked for that provision which prohibits the closed shop and check off in the railway industry. The fact in that regard is that the Railway Brotherhoods have conducted their labor relations with such a degree of dignity and composure and, also, success that they have demonstrated their value and usefulness to their membership to an extent that it has not been found either necessary or desirable to compel employees to join a union in order to obtain employment. On the contrary, employees have sought membership voluntarily.

The bill also prohibits the use of violence, intimidation, and threats so prevalent and effective under existing strike practice. I have never been able to understand the arguments of those who would deny to any free American citizen the right to go to and from his lawful place of business without interference by violence, threats, and intimidation. Today when a strike occurs mass picket lines are thrown about the place of employment. All persons, including the owner of the property, are prevented by force from entering or leaving the premises.

The strikers and the union are protected by Federal law and all of the rest of the American citizens, so far as the Federal Government is concerned, are left to the mercy of mob violence. Time after time, and day after day, people seeking entrance to picketed plants are mauled and beaten, sometimes unmercifully; and although the controversy is one arising under Federal law and being adjudicated by Federal agencies, there is not one word of Federal law anywhere to give any protection to the owners of the property, or to the workers themselves who happen to disagree with the leadership of their union. It is said that the local police authorities should enforce the law against assault and battery, but that claim is merely an effort to evade the real issue. It is well known that in many communities local enforcement authorities are dominated and controlled by union politicians, and when strikes and violence occur the local authorities remain neutral. If the Federal law were amended to provide injunction against violence and intimidation, this type of lawlessness would immediately cease.

I propose a rigid prohibition against sympathy strikes, boycotts, and jurisdictional strikes. Why should the Government countenance a strike by one union that has no grievances against anybody of any kind, simply because an entirely different union, under an entirely different employer, and perhaps in an entirely different community, happens to have a labor dispute?

Why should the Government permit the goods manufactured by one set of employees to be denied access to the markets of the country in interstate commerce simply because some other union happens to dislike the employer or the union whose members manufactured the articles?

Why should we tolerate a stoppage of important and essential production be-

cause two unions cannot make up their minds which one of them should be permitted to do certain types of work? These are merely a few of the absurdities that have grown up under the present laws which Congress has enacted and so far has failed to correct.

The recent coal strike and a number of minor strikes have occurred because of the effort of the unions to organize into their membership the supervisory forces of management. It may be a little difficult for the public to understand without explanation why foremen should not belong to the same union that the other members do. But the whole theory of collective bargaining is based upon the idea that the union sits on one side of the table and the management sits on the other side of the table. For some time past certain unions have been seeking to sit on both sides of the table and to assume the prerogatives of management. The foremen and supervisory forces are a part of the management of business. They are as essential to that management as the president and other members of the executive force. When their allegiance becomes divided between their duties of management and their loyalty to the union, there can no longer be the efficient management that is absolutely essential to the successful operation of any enterprise. In all the field of distressing labor disputes now prevalent there is no principle more important or more fundamental to the efficient operation of industry than that the supervising force of management must remain divorced from the domination of the employees whose work they supervise.

The President has urged the Congress if it is not in agreement with his proposals to formulate and enact its own proposals for legislation.

I suggest to you that the obvious and sensible thing for this House to do is to again pass the same type of legislation that we have passed before by an overwhelming vote and send it over to the doorstep of the other body for such action as it may see fit to take.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. May I ask the gentleman if he attributes any particular significance to the fact that Mr. Petrillo's middle name is Caesar?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. It is very significant.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I should like to ask the gentleman two questions. First, the gentleman, in my opinion, has omitted to discuss the position of General Motors with regard to reconversion when it refuses to abide by a decision reached by representatives of the President.

The second question—

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I can answer but one question at a time, and I do not yield further.

The decision of the Fact Finding Board is that General Motors should just pay

so much money. I guess I am a little bit old-fashioned, but I was raised up in this country and my ancestors were, and we always went out and we bargained for what we wished to purchase. If the price suited us we dealt, if not we did not. If we thought a thing was worth so much, we were willing to pay so much for it. If we thought it was not worth so much, we were not willing to pay for it. Until recent years it never came within the philosophy of the type of people I come from and it never came within the philosophy of the American people that some bureaucratic board sitting in Washington could tell me how much I should be compelled to pay for any service or commodity whether I wanted to pay it or not.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois. Mr. MASON. Is the gentleman from Virginia going to have copies of this speech and the speech which he made on Tuesday printed so that they will be available if we want to pay for them for circulation even by Republicans?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. A number of Members have asked me for copies of the speech I made Tuesday and I am having some printed. I will be glad to have this one printed.

Mr. MASON. The gentleman will also have this one printed?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I will be glad to.

Mr. MASON. I thank the gentleman. Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman from Virginia mentioned opposition on the part of labor to the President's proposal. I am sure he has received some telegrams and messages similar to the ones I have received from corporations and management at least equally violent in their opposition to the President's proposal. Is that not true?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Oh, yes, yes; I do not mean to indicate that I am in sympathy with the objections of industry or with the objections of labor necessarily. I have discussed this matter this morning from my own viewpoint and not from the standpoint or viewpoint of either labor or industry.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 5 minutes following the special orders previously entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLGER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the other special orders, especially the one just requested, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the special order of the gentleman from

Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a column by Walter Lippmann bearing on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SLAUGHTER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE STRIKE SITUATION

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to discuss the intolerable strike situation which has gripped this country for 2 months and which at the present time closely approximates a general strike. Within the next few days I shall ask for the privilege of making a few remarks concerning that subject, and relative to legislation which is so badly needed.

Today I wish to call the attention of the House to the greatest inflationary threat now before the country, which arises directly out of the strike situation. I refer to the proposal to buy temporary industrial peace in the meat-packing and steel industry with the people's money, for no matter how it is disguised, the plan now offered of raising prices to permit wage increases cannot accurately and honestly be called by any other name.

Our whole national thinking on the labor and business problem has become numb and beclouded with the avalanche of ill-considered strikes which have paralyzed large segments of our industrial system. Two months ago we were shocked and aghast at the proposition that we could not make a telephone call from Washington to Chicago, but today we have become so accustomed to the high-handed action of the striking telephone employees, who have virtually stopped our telephone communication system, that we have almost accepted it as the order of the day. This strike and others has had the effect of diverting the country's attention from the danger of the administration's proposed plan of buying a little temporary peace and quiet with the consumers' money.

A Member of Congress, particularly of the House, is close to his people. I live in a typically American city and if my mail from Kansas City, Jackson County, Mo., is any criterion, there are two things that the people are thinking about. The first and foremost is strikes. The second is inflation. Unfortunately, to date most people have not awakened to the fact that these two dangers are interlocking and that their separate and concurring influences can bring us to a degree of misery unknown in this country. This danger should be brought home to the American people before it is too late.

As a Member of Congress I am, and have always been, in favor of price control. With all his mistakes, Chester Bowles has done an outstanding job in the most thankless place in the whole

Government. He has held the line as far as he has been permitted to do so and has shown every indication of wishing to continue that policy. However, with all his good intentions and his ability, Mr. Bowles' efforts will be totally valueless if the proposed plan of granting price increases in order to buy temporary industrial peace is permitted to go through. This policy has not yet gone into effect, and my sole purpose in making these remarks is in an attempt to point out this inflationary threat with the hope that other Members of Congress may join in opposing this dangerous plan. If the price of steel and the price of meat are raised, a spiral of inflation will have been touched off that will make any extension of the Price Control Act on June 30 totally worthless.

From the time of VJ-day, when discussion of wage increases started, most of us have held to the old hardheaded, common-sense business idea that an increase in the cost of production, whether caused by increased wages or increased cost of raw materials, can only be paid for by the ultimate consumer. In some circles at one time the novel idea was put forward that substantial wage increases could be put into effect without raising the price of goods, due to increased production and improved efficiency. There are cases where some wage increases can be put into effect with little, if any, increase in the cost of the finished product, but they are few and far between. Even in these limited cases the wage increase must be moderate. Now, to all practical intents and purposes, this theory has been abandoned even by our unorthodox economic thinkers, and everyone is agreed that substantial increases in wages can only be reflected in the cost of production, which means an increase in the cost of living.

It is a matter of little consequence to a manufacturer what he pays for wages or materials, provided he can pass on his costs to the consumer. The people who care and who will suffer and who should be aware of what will happen are consumers like you and me—the white-collar workers—the fixed-income group, including public employees such as school teachers and persons living on a pension. The fixed-income group, in other words. Yes; even the union member, whose salary gains will be more than offset by the increased cost of living, will be hurt by a spiraling system of increased prices with which his wages will never catch up.

Today, and I mean literally today, the country is faced with two great strike threats. One has already hit—the meat strike. The other will apparently be upon us by Monday next—the steel strike. These two strikes are so basic in character that the manner in which they are handled will mean the difference between a reasonably well-ordered economy and an unbridled inflationary debacle.

Everyone is agreed that these two strikes pose a great threat to our reconversion program. If the great steel mills shut down, it is only a question of time until virtually all manufacturing companies will follow suit. If the meat strike is permitted to continue, the storage houses and individual ice boxes will be stripped of meat by this time next week.

However, bad and alarming as are these two strike prospects, it will be better to face these issues than to buy temporary industrial peace by granting general price increases to induce the packers and steel companies to grant wage increases which they cannot and will not make under the present price ceilings. That is the issue in a nutshell that the administration is called upon to meet and which must be decided almost within a matter of hours. If the decision is made to hike the price of steel and meat, the last dam and bulwark against inflation will be gone and there will be no turning back from that disastrous policy.

In the case of the packers, the effect of such a policy will be felt at once if the price increase is passed on to the consumer. If, on the other hand, the Government attempts the more devious method of absorbing the price increase by raising the subsidy paid to the meat packers, the net result will be the same, although it will not be felt and noticed as quickly. If the latter course is attempted, it means that the long arm of the Government will reach deeper and deeper into our pockets and take more and more funds to pay subsidies to the meat producers in order that we may not so clearly see the fact that the price of meat has risen, and the public debt will continue to rise as these subsidy payments go on. There is no other possibility. There is no other answer to the proposal of hiking the price of meat to buy off the meat strikers. In either event, the people pay.

The proposal to buy off the steel strike by raising the price of steel \$4 per ton in the face of Mr. Bowles' courageous and proper objections is even more alarming. If any product in our complicated civilization and economy is basic, it is steel. It is a product that goes directly into almost every manufactured item except food and clothing, and even there it is used in large quantities. The \$4 per ton raise to the manufacturers of steel will multiply over and over again. The manufacturers of automobiles, refrigerators, washing machines, bed springs, and pots and pans will find their cost of production increased by this \$4 raise, and in the processing the original \$4 will be increased to \$8 or \$12 or \$16 or perhaps \$20 per ton. The next step will be that the manufacturers of automobiles and bed springs and pots and pans will come back to the Office of Price Administration, if we still maintain the then empty gesture of price control, for increases. When they come, they will either get their increases or they will refuse to produce, and the demand for goods will be such that the price will increase and increase. Consequently, the cost of living will rise again and again and again, and even the wage earners in the steel and meat industries will find their wage increases are hollow and empty, and they, together with all other organized workers, will be back for more increases. So, I say that whatever industrial peace is purchased will be temporary in character. There can only be one result, for the race between wages and the cost of living will be on, and the wage earner caught in that spiral can never catch up.

There is no such thing as a little inflation. It is a question of whole hog or nothing. Once the dam is kicked out, such as it will be in the steel and meat industries, there will be no repairing of the damage, for the forces which will be released will be so powerful that they will destroy our economy and system of living, if not the Government itself.

Every thoughtful person feels that wages must remain high after this war. After other wars and over a period of time the price of wages and commodities could and did fall, but then we had no national debt of any real proportions. This time the national debt is \$300,000,000,000, and all of our economic thinking is tied and keyed to this fact. The deflationary idea of cutting wages is unthinkable, but wage increases, to be healthy for the people who receive such increase and for the country as a whole, must be confined to those isolated instances where an increase is possible through increased efficiency or accelerated volume without substantially raising the price to the consumer.

The general and unprecedented strikes that are gripping the Nation are bad. Unbridled inflation is worse and even more dangerous. The present strike danger can be met and conquered without purchasing a little temporary peace with the consumer's money. The administration and the country must meet this strike problem the hard way and not by embracing the opiate of increased prices. Any other plan can only bring destruction and untold suffering to every man, woman, and child. The administration must make the decision within the next few days, and the present problem must be met head-on and fought out courageously and with the long-time welfare of the country in mind.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman vote for the extension of price control?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Would I vote to extend it?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Certainly; I will vote for it. I have voted for it such times as it has been up since I have been a Member of the body.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. I wish to commend the gentleman for his statement. I am very anxious that innocent union men in my district, many of whom are writing me letters, be not held to blame in any way for these strikes, particularly the meat strike.

This is the uniform complaint I am getting, and I recited it earlier today:

We were forced to join the union against our will in order to be able to work and we are also being called out on strike against our will.

Then one man says further:

It must be that there is a communistic element in the high places along the line that is causing these things. Cannot something be done?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman. I want to make one further ob-

servation. This morning, during the colloquy that was going on when various reservations of the right to object were made, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SAVAGE]—and I am sure it was the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SAVAGE]—made the statement, and I think I quote him correctly, that what the country needs is legislation that will bring about industrial peace and legislation that will not crush labor. That is right. No one can disagree with that statement. But I may say to the gentleman that, in my humble opinion, it is not labor, but leaders drunk with power and thirsting for power who are crushing labor. At least, that is true in my own district, which is the one I know most about. For instance, let us take the meat-strike situation, which can only be settled by taking money out of your pocket and mine and giving these increases to the packers. Disorder has already broken out in Kansas City, Mo., and perhaps in the district represented by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], just across the line. This ill-considered strike that is going to strip every ice box in this country of meat before the week is out, plus the disorder, will do a lot more to crush the legitimate aspirations and the legitimate program of labor than any legislation that could be drafted by the most rabid labor baiter the world has ever known.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. May I say to the gentleman that yesterday at exactly 1 o'clock in the afternoon I answered a long-distance telephone call from a GI Joe who was calling me from Munich, Germany. The line was clear. After we had discussed for about 2½ minutes the question of what Congress is doing about demobilization, he propounded a question to me and it was this: "What are you doing about strikes and getting back to reconversion so we will have jobs when we get home?"

I can give his name, but I will not do it. I will simply give his APO number. It is APO 340, and he is a citizen of Cleveland, Ohio.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. Does not the gentleman agree that certain radical labor leaders are making about the same mistake as certain big business did in the twenties? At that time big business had tremendous social power but it refused to accept the social responsibility that went with the power. We find the labor leaders today are making the same mistake.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Unfortunately, big business does not seem to learn many lessons. I do not know of any business bigger than the labor business. The gentleman is absolutely right. They are following the same policy of ignoring public opinion that brought the railroads into disrepute, that brought the public utilities into disrepute, and that right now is bringing the legitimate labor movement into disrepute. I do not think

it is the rank and file labor dues-paying members who are responsible. In my humble judgment, this is a fight between these big autocrats, such as Mr. Reuther and Mr. James Petrillo, and they are responsible for the stamp of public disapproval which is being put upon the rank and file of the union members, the dues-paying members.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman from New York asked the gentleman from Missouri whether he was in favor of an extension of price control, to which the gentleman replied in the affirmative. I want to ask the gentleman whether he does not agree with me that the President's suggestion is very timely; that we should not only continue price control but that we ought to do it now instead of waiting until the last minute and leave that uncertainty.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I do not think there is any question about it. Personally, so far as I am concerned, as a Member of Congress, I would like to see the Committee on Banking and Currency hold hearings and get this bill in here in plenty of time so that we are not under a deadline like we have always been in the past. But what good does it do to bring in a price-control bill if the administration yields in the steel case and in the meat case and gives an increase of \$4 a ton on steel and an increase on meat in order to buy off the strikers? Your inflation is here, and there is nothing you can do about it. It is right along that line and right along the line of my support of the Price Control Act which I have always favored that I have made this speech to try to elaborate on the dangers facing the country.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think the gentleman has created an impression here that labor is seeking these adjustments in wages by asking for an increase in price. That is definitely not so. In the automobile and steel industries, as well as the meat industry, labor's position is that these increases in wages should come out of the bloated profits that these corporations have made. Certainly the gentleman cannot justify Mr. Wilson of General Motors earning over \$8,000 a week.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. The gentleman misunderstood me. I am not talking about labor's proposal right now. It is the Government's proposal to permit these increases in order to buy off the steel strikers and the meat strikers, and I say that in the last analysis, if that is done, the wage increases that the steel workers get and the meat workers get will more than be eaten up in the increased cost of living.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman called on the Committee on Banking and Currency a while ago to bring in a new price-

control bill for the purpose, as I understood, of checking inflation. If the Committee on Banking and Currency really wants to check inflation, what they should do would be to stay within the realm of their prerogatives and bring out legislation to put a stop to the issuance of additional Federal Reserve notes.

Trying to bring price control by preventing inflation is just like trying to fill a barrel by pouring in water at the bung hole with both ends of the barrel out.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. To answer the gentleman's question, I think perhaps the original mistake was when price control first came about, in not being an over-all price control over everything, including wages.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I suppose the gentleman knows that over 52,000,000 people are working in the United States today, and less than 1,000,000 are on strike. That is the greatest force that has ever worked in America.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I have no doubt that that is correct, but that will still not remedy the situation next week when we will not have any meat in our ice boxes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HALLECK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MARCANTONIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a cablegram.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

PEOPLE ARE ENTITLED TO PROTECTION AGAINST RISING PRICES AND INFLATION

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and include a copy of a resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that this country is in the throes of an economic upheaval. The demands for higher wages are met by demands for higher prices, and a vicious circle has started which may lead to disaster for low-income groups, the salaried class, the older citizens who rely on limited incomes for support, and the returned veteran. These people do not have the advantage of belonging to pressure blocs and are, therefore, in no position to meet the rising costs of today.

There can be no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that wage increases are to be given along the entire business and industrial fronts. It follows that prices will increase as a result and hit every consumer, even the man who gets the raise. In the light of this situation it is imperative that this Congress give immediate consideration to the question of continuance of the subsidy program as it is related to foods, and especially with reference to dairy products, meat, and flour.

Mr. Speaker, in May of 1945, this body passed S. 502 to permit the continuance of certain subsidy payments on certain commodities and included as a subsidy 595 million for meat, 100 million for butter, and 190 for flour. These are known as consumer subsidies and I believe that the majority on my side of the aisle have condemned this practice most vigorously. I did not believe, Mr. Speaker, that I would get to the place where I would advocate a continuance of a subsidy program for my voice has been heard on this floor in opposition to it on several occasions. I submit, however, that conditions have changed. When the program was first advanced everybody was working and production was at a maximum. At that time most consumer groups had the money to pay the grocery bill and there was no justification to pass this burden on to future generations.

Today conditions are changed, Mr. Speaker; we are in the midst of reconversion; we are going from a wartime to a peacetime economy. In the ordinary course of events production lessens and wages decrease. Now we are rapidly approaching a situation where production has almost ceased and yet prices and wages are going up. A spiral of inflation is on the way and the payment of subsidies on the food commodities may retard that condition and protect millions of consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I do not ask approval of this suggestion at this time; I merely ask the adoption of a resolution that I introduced yesterday requesting that the Committee on Banking and Currency study and report the matter back to the House. Time is of the essence as the bill passed last May and expires in June of this year. Our people are entitled to some protection and serious consideration should be given their needs.

Resolution 485

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to make a thorough study and investigation of the policies and operations of the Government in relation to subsidies affecting food prices.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House, if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present session the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold hearings, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, records, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpoenas

may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND] is recognized for 10 minutes.

ATLANTIC CITY CARES FOR THE WOUNDED

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, January 14, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] made a very unfortunate speech on the floor of this House. In 1 minute he succeeded in grievously wounding the feelings of 70,000 people.

Words uttered on this floor should not be thoughtless words. We cannot always be right, but we should speak only after reflection and investigation.

The gentleman himself stated that the whole foundation for his talk was a newspaper clipping from the Washington Daily News, which read as follows:

Amputees on the boardwalk at Atlantic City depress visitors and therefore hurt business, civic leaders there feel. Pressure has been brought on the War Department to close the Thomas M. England General Hospital there, which has been an amputation center. Civic leaders argue it's all for good of wounded men.

It is hardly necessary for me to say that there was no truth whatever in this clipping, and therefore, no merit whatever in the gentleman's speech. It is pure gossip, or should I say impure gossip, and is a dastardly reflection on patriotic people who have contributed more than their share to the war effort, and who have been in the forefront of all humanitarian activities.

There is certainly no citizen of Atlantic City, and I hope, none in America, who would not do everything possible for the crippled heroes resulting from this cruel war. If the author of the article, or the gentleman from California, knows of a single person in Atlantic City who would subscribe to the disgusting sentiments expressed in the news item, let him be named. There is not one. If any proof is necessary, I can produce a petition headed by the mayor and commissioners, and signed by 50,000 people, to keep these men in Atlantic City.

I have just received a telegram from a constituent which quotes a part of the reply of the mayor of Atlantic City to this slander. The telegram follows:

Congressman VOORHIS' remarks on the floor Monday regarding a Washington columnist's report that some businessmen of Atlantic City had brought pressure on the War Department to bar Army amputees from the boardwalk has done the city of Atlantic City and its 60,000 citizens a grave injustice. There is nothing further from the truth. I have here a copy of Mayor Joseph Altman's letter to the Washington Daily News and I would like to quote it in part. His letter gives the correct picture as we know it. He states: "Recently excerpts of your article pertaining to Atlantic City's thoughts as to the amputees were sent to me. There is no scintilla of truth in the statement contained in your newspaper. No civic club, no one in the city government, no citizen has ever so expressed themselves. Factually the reverse is true. As a city, its people went all

out in our war effort and entertainment of the men of the military and Navy housed in this city during the war. We had here, in addition to the hospitals, basic training for ground school Air Corps, Coast Guard, redistribution centers, Air Corps, and Infantry. City officials, civic clubs, and individual citizens were recipients of citations of thanks from the commanding officers of these installations when they left our town after the war. It was only a week or so ago that I personally signed a petition which had for its purpose the retention of the England General Hospital. I am very curious to learn the identification of your informant, if you care to divulge it. I am likewise requesting a retraction of the article along the lines I suggest in this letter. I feel you realize that it is not a question of personalities but a question of a city's reputation, whose citizens oversubscribed every bond issue and who sent thousands of young men and women to service, several hundred of whom gave their lives. It is so unfair to this city that I wish you would please retract or, at least, publish my side of this issue."

Mr. Speaker, these things are true of my own knowledge. Atlantic City was engaged in almost every phase of the war effort, and its citizens performed far above and beyond the call of duty.

The gentleman from California said in his remarks, "I earnestly hope that this report is untrue." I can assure him that it is wholly untrue. I have heretofore entertained respect for the good conscience of the gentleman, and I hope he will permit me to keep that respect by frankly stating that he was misinformed.

Atlantic City has been honored in helping to care for these men, and it is not only willing but anxious to continue this sacred duty.

Mr. Speaker, there is another point that I would like to bring up. There are presently in this city 109 paraplegic patients. That means they are paralyzed. No sacrifice has been greater than theirs, and they are entitled to every care and comfort which this great Nation can give them. The Surgeon General has ordered the discontinuance of England General Hospital on March 31, 1946, and it is planned to remove these boys from Atlantic City. One hundred and one of one hundred and nine patients have filed a pitiful petition to remain where they are comfortably and well cared for. Let me quote from a letter received from Miss Frances Fedrov, of Vineland, in my district, who is a member of a committee interested in the plight of these unfortunate men:

First of all, let's get it straightened out as to just who or what the paraplegics are. These veterans of World War II are the wounded who have injured nerve centers and are paralyzed. Cord injury patients with paraplegia represent one of the most seriously wounded groups resulting from the war. Most of the men are paralyzed from the waist down, but in 25 cases out of the 109 at England General these young men are paralyzed from the neck down. Obviously they must receive unending care. Many of these boys cannot feed themselves. All of them suffer terrible pain. Their progress is very slow and exceptionally tedious. Lying in bed for 8 months or more without moving is not an unusual occurrence.

Atlantic City is a wonderful place for this particular type of patient.

I should like to quote from a petition that was signed by 101 of the paraplegic patients on the seventh floor out of a total number of

109 patients that was published toward the end of December in their own newspaper, the Myel-Stone. "We are located in a city of 66,000 population, in a hospital that was formerly a civilian hotel. This building has direct access to a 5-mile long boardwalk with sloping ramps that were constructed before the onset of this war and offers all patients an opportunity to visit restaurants, stores, and theaters in the shopping district. The large number of hotels and recreational facilities on the boardwalk level give further sources of diversion to the patient. All patients have expressed the feeling that this civilian contact, which we would not have if we were located in a hospital a few miles distant from any city, has been most beneficial in our rehabilitation. We have lost our fears of self-consciousness by our constant mingling with normal citizens. Furthermore, the constant temperature and weather conditions of this city lend itself to outdoor activities on our part, and the fact that the city is virtually an island at sea level allows us to reach all parts of the city without difficulty from concrete sidewalks and ramps. This city is served by railroad facilities, and it is located close to large population centers in the East. There are accommodations available for our families and relatives for frequent visits, and transportation is available for us to visit nearby cities of Philadelphia and New York."

Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask the Surgeon General, and I am going to ask General Bradley of the Veterans' Administration to grant this plea. If it be necessary to vacate England General Hospital, Atlantic City can still offer the facilities that these men plead for, and will consider their care not a duty, but an honor.

There is no place on earth which has more to offer their convalescence and comfort, and no place with citizens whose hearts are bigger.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAND. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from New Jersey has pointed out very forcefully the danger of a Member of Congress taking the floor and reading a newspaper article which reflects on a community or on a Member of Congress without first investigating the truth or falsity of that article.

Mr. HAND. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi. That is my opinion also.

Mr. RANKIN. I am glad the gentleman from New Jersey has made this explanation because I cannot think that there are any people in the United States who would object to these boys who fought for their country enjoying all the benefits that their community provides.

Mr. HAND. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Folger). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

DEMOBILIZATION OF ARMED FORCES— INCREASE PAY FOR ARMY OF OCCUPATION

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion in Congress and throughout the country with respect to the demobilization of men in the armed forces. The plan of demobilization has bogged down. Hundreds of thousands of men in the Pacific and in Europe, many who have seen combat service, are still waiting to

be released. It is the uncertainty of the thing that makes conditions worse.

One of the things that has happened to create so much dissatisfaction is the failure on the part of those in charge of our armed forces to tell the people and the men in service more about their plans with respect to the question of demobilization. In time of war, it was all right and proper that certain information be withheld, but now that the war is over, certainly the War Department and the Navy Department and those men dealing with the entire problem should have explained and should explain now, as definitely as they can, what they have in mind with regard to the over-all problem of maintaining armed forces in various parts of the world.

Mr. Speaker, men who have been serving in the war theaters for many months feel, and rightly so, that they are entitled to be returned at the earliest possible date. There should not be any unnecessary delay. If they are being delayed for some reason, then it ought to be explained to them right on the spot.

Among reasons given by top-flight officials for slow down in demobilization is the need of replacements for occupational forces. It is claimed they are not sure that enlistments and reenlistments will be sufficient to provide satisfactory occupational forces.

Mr. Speaker, the proper manner for solving the problem of occupational forces is to make enlistments in the service more attractive for men who are willing to spend time in the armed forces. The thing to do is to increase the amount of pay for men who enlist in the Regular Army and who serve as occupational forces in foreign countries.

If it should be \$75 per month in place of \$50, or even more, it will be a whole lot better than to keep men in the army of occupation who were given to understand quite definitely they would have a chance to go home immediately after the war was over.

Personally, I do not think we are going to need huge armies in Europe or in the Pacific, but whatever armed forces are required, let the soldiers have substantial pay and there will be no difficulty in securing plenty of men to do the job.

It will really not cost any more money in the long run than is being spent now. There will not be so many men with dependents and the armed forces will not need to be as big as presently contemplated. Also cut drastically the number of high ranking officers.

You will certainly dispose of the problem of dissatisfied and homesick soldiers, because those who enlist under this plan will understand they are going in for a period of 3 or 4 years and will receive substantial pay therefor.

They will not be combat soldiers, of course, but men who enlisted to help carry out the problem of reconversion, redeployment, and settlement among the nations of the world. They will have the deep satisfaction of knowing that they are not only performing an important service to their country, but will also be taking the places of men who have already performed their services and who will thereby get to go home at a much earlier date.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and insert a statement by General of the Army Dwight Eisenhower, supplementing his remarks on demobilization made on last Tuesday. I have received an estimate from the Government Printing Office stating that it would require seven and one-half pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at an estimated cost of \$390. I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding the additional cost, that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

LABOR UNREST

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal today and have been reading considerable in the press lately about demands for antilabor legislation. There seems to be a feeling that if the Congress will only pass a law, somehow all the unrest in the country, no matter how caused, will subside, and everyone, capital and labor, will get along together. Of course, this is an illusion. Strikes and walk-outs are caused by perfectly straightforward, understandable situations, the chief among them being that since April of last year there has been at least a 23 percent cut in the take-home pay of the average worker. In some instances, with the hours of weekly labor dropping from 43 to 30 hours, meaning a staggered workweek, the cut has been more than 23 percent, running in the neighborhood of 50 percent.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DE LACY. I yield for a brief question as my time is limited.

Mr. RICH. The workers' pay was all caused by extra work, being paid for overtime during the war, was it not?

Mr. DE LACY. Not all of it; there was upgrading and other factors that entered into it. There were also basic wage rate increases which, in many instances, tended to maintain a higher level of wages.

Mr. RICH. During the war when everybody was bending every effort to prosecute the war to its successful conclusion men were receiving high wages. Does the gentleman believe that those men who have a much larger wage scale should continue to receive the same wages if it is not necessary for the manufacturer who is now dealing with the furnishing of merchandise to civilians, he himself being held at the 1941 levels, levels which were created by freezing retail prices but not wages; and those prices are not allowed to rise?

Mr. DE LACY. The gentleman has me confused. If he asks me if I think wages should be cut, my answer is "No." I decline to yield further.

Mr. RICH. But the manufacturers' prices have all been frozen so that they

cannot meet the increased cost of production.

Mr. DE LACY. I would rather not yield further. I have only 5 minutes.

Mr. RICH. If you increase the cost of labor, the manufacturer ought to have a price increase which represents the fair amount of the increased wages.

Mr. DE LACY. We must, of course, maintain wage rates in this country or we shall have a depression the like of which has never been seen. I decline to yield further.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman spoke about being fair. I just want the gentleman to be fair.

Mr. DE LACY. The thing that is asked of us is to try to repress the right of the people to seek last resort redress of their economic grievances through the strike route. We were told this morning by a distinguished Member that a few dictators were keeping the folks from having automobiles and that they were going to force us back to the horse-and-buggy days. I believe the gentleman was correct. A few dictators, economic dictators, are trying to force us back into the horse-and-buggy era, and the name of one of those dictators is the General Motors Corporation. I think it is perfectly plain. That corporation refused negotiations. That corporation refused conciliation. That corporation refused arbitration. That corporation refused to attend and participate in the sessions of the Fact Finding Board appointed by the President of the United States. That corporation is trying to smash labor. It is trying to put the gun to OPA to compel the Government to raise auto prices. It wants to bring about an increase in the cost of automobiles to the people of this country. That corporation has money bags bulging with war profits, and still it does not want to help the purchasing power of this Nation by passing out some of those profits to workers so that they in turn can purchase the commodities of other manufacturers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Carroll County Independent entitled "More Dictation."

Mr. LANDIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in regard to a petition signed by 30,000 war mothers of the United States pertaining to a bonus for the veterans of World War II.

Mr. HALE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the New York Times of yesterday and an article by Mr. Walter Lippmann, entitled "The White House Department."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

LABOR

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it was through the suffering of our young men and women that this war was won; and I am wondering if those of us who re-

mained at home are not taking the wrong attitude. The men and women in the service made the sacrifices necessary to the winning of this war. Now, many of us who remained at home, in business, and in jobs in industrial plants, made more money than ever before. When the fighting was over we found ourselves with an enormous public debt. Do you not think that it would have been well for us here at home, both businessmen and employees, if we had started our campaign of making sacrifices instead of asking more, all of us taking a little less, so as to have made conditions better for those who are returning and make it possible, perhaps, to reduce the national debt?

Mr. Speaker, as soon as the war is over, many seek not only to maintain the take-home pay and profits but to increase wages and profits. I just do not understand that attitude of mind on the part of those who remained here in safety and in comfort—insisting that all of us should, now that the war is over, have more and, in any event, no less than we had while the war was going on.

There are figures available which show that the take-home pay of some of the workers in the oil industry, under the plan in operation before these strikes, gives them more in purchasing power, not only in dollars and cents but in purchasing ability, than they had during the war.

Some of these figures I recall. They are as follows:

From an ad of the Texas Co. I take the following:

3. The Texas Co. offered a 15-percent increase prior to the strike. That increase represents 46 hours of pay for 40 hours of work. The employees have been working 48 hours per week and receiving pay for 52 hours.

5. At Port Arthur, Tex., in January 1941, the average hourly rate, excluding overtime, was 93 cents. Now this figure is \$1.21—an increase of 30 percent, but due to overtime premium payments the average hourly earning now is \$1.31—an increase of 40 percent.

6. In January 1941 the average take-home pay on the basis of a 36-hour week was \$33.50 per week. After applying the company's offer of a 15-percent increase and reducing the workweek from 48 to 40 hours, the average take-home pay would be \$55.44 per week—an increase in take-home pay of 65 percent over January 1941. This compares with an increase in the cost of living of approximately 30 percent.

From a page ad of General Motors I quote as follows:

Today, unions in our plants are demanding 52 hours' pay for 40 hours' work. Their demands, if granted, would result in over 67 hours' pay at present base rates for 48 hours of work where plants are working on such a schedule.

We all know that the increase in the dollar wage may or may not mean something other than the opportunity to get and spend more money. The real test is what the workingman's dollar will buy of the things he must have.

Let me once more quote from the United States News of November 30, 1945:

Standards of living for this country's employed workers outside of farms have been rising steadily since 1933. As the Pictogram shows, by 1939 these standards topped the

boom year of 1929, and now are higher than ever before.

The figures in the Pictogram represent the actual buying power of the average jobholder—the goods and services he could buy and the savings he could make after taking cost of living and Federal taxes into account. The figures include all wage and salary workers and all persons who receive income from their own business or profession.

In 1929, the average income of the working United States citizen, adjusted for taxes and living costs, was \$1,331. Actual dollar earnings in that year were \$1,640, but living costs, as measured by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, were higher than they were in either 1933 or 1939. Cost of living in 1929 was 23 percent higher than the average in 1939, thereby reducing real income to \$1,331 on the average.

In 1933, the real income of the average United States nonfarm worker had dropped to \$1,256. The average dollar income in that depression year was lower than that—\$1,163—but the cost of living in that year was only 93 percent of the 1939 average.

In 1939, recovery had carried real income of the employed population to an average of \$1,435 per worker. That corresponds to the actual dollar earnings of that year, since this year is taken as the base year for measuring cost of living. Thus, on the eve of war, American workers on the whole had succeeded in raising living standards by approximately 14 percent above the depression low.

In 1945, when war ended, the real income per worker was averaging \$1,603 a year, 27 percent above 1933 and almost 12 percent above 1939. War brought sharply higher taxes, the first time an income of this size was taxed, and sharply higher living costs (28.9 percent above prewar), but dollar earnings more than kept pace with this rise. Actual dollar earnings of workers this year was averaging \$2,346 a year when Japan surrendered.

Rising living standards also are reflected in the number of United States citizens who are able to find jobs. In 1929, for example, the working population off farms was 36,177,000 persons. By 1933, the number of nonfarm workers had dropped to 28,081,000, but 6 years after again approached the 1929 figure at 35,759,000. In 1945, civilian employment reached its highest point with 44,470,000 persons at work.

Total employment, as well as average income, thus is a measure of United States progress.

"Real" income of average United States worker¹

	Annually
1929-----	\$1,331
1933-----	1,256
1939-----	1,435
1945-----	1,603

¹ Nonfarm wages, salaries, and payments to management after Federal taxes and adjusted for cost-of-living changes.

There has been a whole lot of bunk put out about this take-home pay proposition and even if it were true that they are to have less, I say as good patriotic Americans willing to do their part in what follows the war all of us, and I mean all, should be willing to take less instead of squawking about getting more. An increase in wages followed by an increase in prices gets us nowhere.

My proposition, again stated, is this: Having remained here at home in safety, having neither starved, been shot at, bayoneted, forced to bail out of a plane over hostile territory, over the sea, we have fared fairly well. Should we not now, by accepting less, by demanding less, begin to make some real worth-

while contribution toward what so many refer to as "the winning of the peace."

Mr. Speaker, I am thoroughly familiar with the practice of those who brand every bit of legislation which comes before a committee of this House and which is opposed by any one of the labor leaders as being antilabor. The legislation which I have introduced and which I have had a chance to support has not been antilabor. It has been antilabor-political-boss legislation. I am as anxious, and no more anxious, to trim, and by that you know what I mean, the would-be labor dictators and racketeers as I am those in the Republican Party or any other organization who seek to use others for their own selfish end and to the detriment of our national welfare. I have seen the time in my short life when I had to prosecute a minister of the gospel; I have seen the time when I had to threaten to take out a body warrant against another attorney to force repayment of a client's funds; but the fact I did so is no reason why I should be charged with opposing the ministers or their teachings or the lawyers, members of the profession to which I belong.

A LABOR POLICY

The need of a constructive labor policy now seems apparent to practically everyone. From the day when the National Labor Relations Act—commonly known as the Wagner Act—was under consideration by the Congress, thoughtful, unbiased students of legislation were convinced that it would not—as was its announced purpose—lessen the causes of labor disputes.

Experience has demonstrated that laws, to be effective, must have back of them an enlightened favorable public opinion. A favorable public opinion cannot be created and, over the years maintained for an unfair legislative enactment.

The NLRA was unfair to employers, who are usually recognized as a necessary part of our economic society, in that, while giving special privileges to unions and union members, it gave no corresponding benefits to employers—management—and investors—stockholders.

It imposed duties and liabilities upon employers without requiring any responsibility or obligations from either unions or members of unions.

It was unjust to non-union employees in that under it union employees and employers acting together could bar non-union men from the right to work, or force them to pay tribute in order to work.

It was unjust to employees in that while it protected them from coercion from employers when attempting to organize or bargain collectively, it did not protect them from coercion from union organizers or officials, or from coercion from other sources. To prove this last statement, it is but necessary to recall the facts which have been common in most jurisdictional disputes and strikes, as well as in many a campaign to organize a union or to obtain collective bargaining rights.

Employers have complained bitterly of the maladministration of the act by the

NLRB. Green, Murray, and Lewis, presidents of the three major unions, have been just as bitter and vigorous in their criticism of the NLRB.

The present widespread disputes and strikes seem to have convinced some of labor's champions—of what some of us have long known and earnestly advocated, that is, that the National Labor Relations Act must be amended if the Nation is to be saved from civil strife, economic disaster. Over the years some of the Members of Congress—and it has been my lot to be one of them—have vigorously and persistently insisted that unless certain basic amendments were adopted we would eventually be confronted by labor dictators, labor politicians, who, acting within the law as it stands, would, through their political and economic power, bring about inflation, strangle production, and disrupt the Nation's business. That day is now here. Proof of that fact is found in the utterances of Donald Richberg who, as a Government official in the early New Deal years and later as an attorney, has for years been the champion of the unions, union leaders, and union politicians, advocating their theories, supporting their acts. Mr. Richberg, as attorney for the unions, has frequently given them some good advice. That advice was just as frequently disregarded. Apparently, now seeing clearly the apparent results of that policy, he has the courage to warn the unions which he has so warmly defended, in a recent New York speech, in which among other things he said—I ask the gentleman from California [Mr. DE LACY] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] if they agree with this statement:

Labor leaders are generally suffering from the delusions of rapidly swollen authority gained by political influence, by a special immunity from legal restraints, and by the command of organized force and violence which a sympathetic public permitted them to acquire and exercise in the days when unorganized, helpless wage earners were the common victims of injustice.

I ask the gentleman from California, does he agree with that statement?

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DE LACY. Much as I appreciate being referred to as the gentleman from California, may I tell the gentleman that I come from the State of Washington.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman agree with that statement?

Mr. DE LACY. You make your speech.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, you know, you just cannot nail those, who here on the floor speak for labor, down to a specific proposition? You cannot get an answer to a fair question out of those who so often assume they alone speak for labor. Let me ask them about this, referring to these labor leaders:

their hostility to impartial government. They feel they are still entitled to an unfair deal.

Do you endorse that?

With shortsighted selfishness, they are trying to create an economic system in which all wage earners would be compelled to join

unions and to accept the fixation of wages and jobs under the monopoly control of labor politicians. Their success would end a free, competitive economy and produce some form of state socialism as the inevitable outgrowth of the labor dictatorship which they are seeking to establish.

I say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER], do you agree with that? Is that what they are after? The gentleman declines to answer. I do not assume that by his silence he gives consent. I ask him if he agrees to this statement.

The gentlemen, though present, remain silent.

As free people we can no more permit organized labor to dictate terms to management and to regulate management than we could permit management to dictate terms to labor and to regulate labor organizations.

The spectacle of several hundred thousand men launching an industrial war today should warn us that tomorrow several million may deliberately paralyze the Nation's energies. When an irresponsible labor boss today can stop the fuel, transportation, phone, and telegraph services of great cities, we should realize that tomorrow the entire Nation may be denied the necessities of life.

I ask the gentleman who just preceded me here and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] who assume to speak for organized labor and organized leaders, do you agree that that is the situation today?

Let me continue to read:

The spectacle of a labor bloc in Congress today cringing under the whips of labor lobbyists should warn us that tomorrow a majority of the Congress may be whipped into line to pass laws to establish a labor domination—and that subservient administrators and courts may be forcing the freemen of America again to revolt against such a tyrannical government and again to fight for their liberties.

I quote those statements. If I made those statements here, if the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] made those statements, or if any other Member of the House made those statements, he would be branded as antilabor, as wanting to enslave the worker. But the statements that I have read were those which came from Donald Richberg—let me repeat for the sake of emphasis—an early official in the New Deal, for years an advocate, the attorney of the unions, and of the union leaders. But the situation today so stinks to high heaven, it is so dangerous, that Donald Richberg, labor's champion, when it needed a champion, today condemns them. As the gentleman from Virginia said earlier in the day, we have not the courage here in the House to do one single thing about it.

Those of us who have seen the storm clouds gathering, who have recognized the condition toward which we were drifting, have repeatedly, over the years on the floor of the House and elsewhere, pointed out the unfair provisions of the NLRA, the unjust acts of the NLRB, the arbitrariness, the arrogance, and the assumption of dictatorship by labor leaders, and suggested appropriate amendments. For our attempts to remedy the situation, which we did by offering appropriate amendments, labor leaders and their friends, and more than one publication, rewarded us by false charges of being labor baiters seeking to

enslave the worker, intent only upon serving the interests of the employer.

Perhaps, now that Mr. Richberg, labor's champion, admits the need for constructive legislation, now that millions of people have been and, if the strikes continue, will be not only inconvenienced but seriously injured, their protests may, in volume and in intensity, drown out the whip-like command of the labor lobbyists here in Washington, and induce the people's representatives in Congress assembled to give the country equitable legislation which will protect the man who wants to work, the man who creates and maintains the job, and, more important, the average citizen.

Earlier in the week there was offered by me a bill which, if adopted and fairly enforced, will go a long, long way toward settling labor disputes, lessening the number and the intensity of strikes in those industries which supply vital transportation, communication, light, heat, power, and water services to the people of the country. If the leadership of either side of the House will get back of that or of a similar bill, the country will have at least a partial remedy—and I think, a complete one—for the disputes and strikes which tie up the service rendered by public utilities. Let me beseech the House to support such legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, when I entered the Chamber this afternoon I had no intention of engaging in controversy with other Members of this House. Furthermore, I do not intend this afternoon to even presume to make a full-dress speech on the labor question. I do intend to make such a speech some time during the next 10 days or 2 weeks. But certain remarks have been made on the floor this afternoon that lead me to take the rostrum for a short period.

First of all I want to take up one of the points raised by the gentleman from Virginia in his speech. The gentleman from Virginia proceeded to castigate the Committee on Labor for holding up bills. Any Member of this House is, of course, entitled to his own opinion whether or not the committee is holding up bills. But I do want to make one point to the membership of this House. It seems to me that it comes with ill grace from a Member of the Committee on Rules to talk about holding up a bill when the Fair Employment Practice Committee bill, which was passed out by the Committee on Labor many, many months ago, is still languishing in the refrigerator of the Committee on Rules. It certainly has been placed on ice.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is not the gentleman a member of the Committee on Labor?

Mr. BIEMILLER. No, I am not.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thought the gentleman was.

Mr. BIEMILLER. No. I am a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs. I am not a member of the Committee on Labor. After all, the gentleman is a

member of the Committee on Labor. He has not seen me around any meetings, has he?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No, but I have not seen many other New Dealers around there, either.

Mr. BIEMILLER. In my humble opinion, the Committee on Labor is showing good sense in not precipitously rushing out a labor bill. First of all, I think we ought to recognize the fact that you cannot settle the problem of strikes by legislation. Particularly you cannot settle it by any kind of repressive legislation which is designed to curtail the rights of labor. Other countries have tried to curtail labor's rights by legislation. Australia, for example, has had a law for a great many years establishing compulsory arbitration, a law making it illegal to strike, but have strikes been stopped in Australia? Of course they have not, because any group of human beings who feel they have an economic injustice and feel that their employers refuse to deal fairly with that injustice, refuse to sit down and thrash out a good sound bargain, those workers will strike. That has been true from the beginning of history and it will continue to be true.

There has been one country in modern times in which strikes have been forbidden and the rights of labor have been curtailed, and you know where it happened. It was Germany under Hitler. I think those of you who have been lending your ears to the siren songs of the labor haters of this country who have been trying to get the Members of Congress, the majority of whom I think are fair-minded men, to listen to their cry of hate against labor unions, had better do a little studying of the pattern that worked out in Germany. The first move Hitler made was against the labor organizations in that country. First he repressed their rights and then he knocked them out of existence altogether. The result was that the main strength of the democratic forces, the core of the group that could have fought fascism, was wiped out. Once Hitler took care of the labor organizations of Germany he proceeded to attack commerce and industry in that country, until he finally got to the point where nothing meant anything in Germany except the Nazi Party and its satellites.

I warn you that that is the kind of path certain people in this country would like to have you pursue. You had better think a long time before you attack the Committee on Labor or any other committee of this Congress and ask them to bring in measures destroying labor's basic rights, and particularly any attack upon the basic right to strike.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I do not disagree with the gentleman in that respect. I think labor has the right to strike. But I want to ask the gentleman this question. I know it is the duty of Members of Congress to try to be fair. I think we all ought to be fair. We ought to give everybody an equal right in all laws that are passed. Does the gentleman believe the laws we have now, the Wagner Act, for

instance, which gives labor certain rights, should not give the same rights to the man who gives employment that it gives to the man who is employed?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I am coming to just that point. I am glad the gentleman raised the question. I will proceed to answer it in some detail.

Mr. RICH. It could be answered yes or no.

Mr. BIEMILLER. No; there is a long answer.

Mr. RICH. Certainly it could.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I shall not yield further until I answer this question.

I was coming to the question of the Wagner Labor Act. First of all, let us go back for a moment and remember why the Wagner Labor Act was passed. That act was passed because for many, many years in this country while employees technically had the right to organize and technically had the right to use all legitimate economic weapons in their fight to obtain higher wages and better working conditions, there was nothing on the statute books of the United States or of any of the States which prevented employers from interfering with the internal affairs of unions. Over and over and over again in the long labor history of this country unions would be formed and employers would come in and smash them. Also there was nothing that forced an employer to recognize the rights of labor. Employers used to stand aloof, they would refuse to bargain, just as they are doing today. That happened over a long period of time, until finally the people of the United States agreed that labor should have certain basic rights guaranteed to it, the right to organize and the right to bargain collectively, and conversely that the employer should not have the right to interfere with the internal affairs of a labor organization, and that employers had a definite responsibility to bargain collectively with their employees.

That is basically what the Wagner Labor Act provides. That is the essence of the Wagner Labor Act. It set up certain things that the employer could not do, which they had been doing in the past, to interfere with labor organizations. It wiped out the company unions, the Charlie McCarthy unions, which we had for so many years, where the employers simply talked to themselves across the bargaining table. I hope that day is gone forever. I hope we have firmly established the fact that collective bargaining will continue to be a fundamental part of American life; that labor unions are a basic factor in American life, and that they and the employers have now reached approximately a basis of equality as they face each other across the conference table.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Conceding the right of employees to strike in every industry except in those services which are furnishing the public, such as communications, food, light, power, and water, conceding that, does the gentleman think

that those who strike in industry, as they have a right to do, should also have the right to keep others, who want to work from their jobs, by force or by mass picket lines?

Mr. BIEMILLER. The question of force and violence is an old favorite of the gentleman from Michigan. He knows that no man in his right mind favors force and violence.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the gentleman will yield, I am asking you if you do not know and if you have not noticed pictures in the papers which show that picket lines, by blocking entrances to factory gates, do, by force, by mass picket lines, keep workers from going in?

Mr. BIEMILLER. What I know is this: I know that when an economic situation has become grave and the employees feel that the employer is refusing to even sit down and justly consider their demands, passions get awfully hot. When workers are forced to the extreme of a strike, which none of them wants to do—no worker likes to strike, it is no pleasant pastime, it is a tough deal for everybody concerned—but when workers are forced to strike by an employer, they are going to see to it that no one else gets their jobs. His job is the closest thing to a property right that most workers have in this world. He believes he has a right in that job, and the Wagner Act establishes the fact that the striker is still considered as an employee. One court decision after another has definitely maintained that such is the basic law of the land. The Supreme Court has settled the issue by declaring that a striking worker is still an employee and is always to be considered as an employee of the struck firm.

I will be glad at a later date to debate this entire issue on the floor of this House with the gentleman from Michigan, but I am not yielding any further today.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have 3 additional minutes to answer a very simple and clear question which I asked him.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] has expired.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, if there are no other special orders, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There are other special orders.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] is recognized.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, this Congress in the next few weeks will have considerable discussion upon the various pros and cons of labor.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I wonder if you will endeavor to learn whether the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER], who just preceded you, and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. De Lacy] uphold the right of strikers, by mass picket lines, to prevent other men going to work.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman knows that some organized-labor

leaders do just that with their racketeering methods.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But I am anxious to learn whether the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] and the other gentleman who spoke believe that.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] should take about 30 minutes under a special order at some other time to answer that question.

After visiting for 2 weeks in my district in Nebraska, I come back, thoroughly convinced that the public is greatly concerned about labor-management difficulties. The public is mad. They are not necessarily antilabor, but they are certainly antistrikes. If strikes continue to go on, they will become definitely antilabor.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that certain labor legislation is needed to correct some of the inequities which now exist in the so-called Wagner labor law. This labor law, in my opinion, permits the racketeers of labor to commit acts which if committed by industry would be considered a violation of the law and industry would be subject to penalties. I believe what is sauce for the goose should be sauce for the gander. We needed labor laws to protect labor, because there was a time when industry was taking an unfair advantage of the laboring man. It seems to me that the time has now arrived when labor and its leaders are taking an unfair advantage, not only of industry, but of the public. In every strike, there are three parties involved. The employer, the employee, and the public. It is the public which frequently gets hurt in the brawls between labor and in the strikes. I would like to suggest the principles of the following legislation which I believe to be fundamental and should help to remedy many of the problems which now exist. I believe we need:

First. Legislation to make labor and industry responsible for its contracts. This should prevent the many small wildcat strikes.

Second. Legislation to prevent jurisdictional strikes between unions.

Third. Legislation providing for a cooling-off period. In my opinion, when collective bargaining fails there should be a conciliator who would try to adjust differences between labor and industry and if this fails, the controversy should be referred to a judicial court. I would suggest putting the names of the Federal judges in a hat, drawing out three names and letting them adjudicate the differences between labor and industry. I would do this particularly as it relates to public utilities, transportation and communication. I believe the court's findings should be final and both labor industry should be made to abide by these findings, subject to penalty for noncompliance.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the closed shop is wrong. I believe the maintenance of membership and the check-off system, which is imposed upon industry is wrong. That, however, seems to be a policy of this administration and perhaps cannot be changed at this time. I believe in the right to strike, but I also believe in the right to work. I believe we should have

collective bargaining. Labor should be protected, but also industry and the public, particularly, needs protection. It seems to me that it is wrong for one man to have so much power that he can, by the wave of his hand, call thousands of men out on strike. Many of these men do not want to strike. They have families. They need their pay check. They want to work.

I believe also there should be some definition of picketing. The State of Nebraska has a picketing law, and it works. It is certainly wrong when unions, through violence, force, and mechanical methods, can prevent an employer from entering his own place of business. I am just as certain as can be that unless labor assists in getting some sound, constructive labor legislation, that sooner or later this Congress will be forced to adopt legislation which may not be satisfactory to either labor or industry.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. SAVAGE. I just wanted to ask the gentleman if the Nebraska law against the picket line also provides that the employer cannot hire a new crew while the workers are on strike?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am not sure as to that. We passed that law back in 1927, and it is working. There is no picketing going on in Nebraska. I cite an example of the truck strike in Nebraska. On December 12 there were 500 carloads of freight tied up in Omaha, Nebr. This was freight which the merchants of many towns of Nebraska and Iowa wanted for their Christmas trade. The freight contained much that the citizens of the State needed badly. The truck drivers of Nebraska, in an actual vote, voted not to strike, and yet one Daniel Tobin, president of the teamsters' union in New York City, had within his power to say to all the truck drivers of 12 Midwestern States that you shall not work. If those men went back to work, it meant loss of their jobs if and when this strike was settled.

I now yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. In all kindness I must say to the gentleman that I believe he would belong to a union if he were a laboring man, because I understand he is a member of the American Medical Association; and if that is not one of the tightest combines or groups ever organized, then I do not know what it is.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I happen to be an attorney, and I am a union man because in Michigan a lawyer cannot practice law until he pays \$5 a year union dues. Now, I do not like it, and I object to it. It is not because I have to pay the \$5, but I am opposed to it on principle.

I wish the gentleman from Nebraska would ask the gentleman from Washington [Mr. De Lacy] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] whether they are back of this theory that because

the men have a right, as they say a property right, in a job they should be permitted to hold up the shipment of food that the gentleman referred to in the West and cut off the meat supply of the city of Washington and other places? I wish you would get that out of them. I would like to have them get on the record.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That would be an impossible task, I may say to the gentleman. He has been trying to do that and I as a member of another profession would not be any more successful.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Belonging to a profession which fights to the last ditch for a man's life and for his health, I know of no reason why the gentleman should abandon this effort to get two gentlemen to answer that question.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am sure they are in the same boat as the Labor Department, pro-labor—they are biased. The Labor Department should represent the public but their personnel are all pro-labor—we need legislation and now.

REQUEST TO ADJOURN OVER

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I submitted a unanimous consent request to the effect that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next. At this time I should like to renew that unanimous consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there are two more full days in this week. In view of the statement of President Truman that we ought to get at this legislation, in view of the fact that long ago we sent over to the other body an antiracketeering bill which that body has not acted on as yet, I do not want the House to go on a sit-down strike. So I think I will object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I am doing this because I am supporting the President's position that this House ought to take action on some of this legislation. I object.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 488

Resolved, That AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY be, and he is hereby, elected chairman of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Invalid Pensions.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 18, 1946, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Securities Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 2 o'clock p. m. Friday, January 18, 1946. Business to be considered: Resume hearing in the study of operations pursuant to the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, to hear representatives of the holding-company segment of the industry.

COMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

The Committee on the Census will hold hearings on H. R. 4781 on Thursday and Friday mornings, January 24 and 25, 1946, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

942. A letter from the Administrator, Surplus Property Administration, transmitting a report on synthetic rubber plants and facilities; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

943. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting a report concerning the number of enlisted men on active duty in the Regular Army as of December 31, 1945, who have been enlisted or reenlisted on or after June 1, 1945; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

944. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

945. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report of the Comptroller General of the United States of the work of the General Accounting Office for the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

946. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed joint resolution, to amend section 3 of the act of April 12, 1945, by extending the authorization to pay subsidies to include commodities of the 1946 crop; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

947. A letter from the Administrator, Surplus Property Administration, transmitting a report on aviation gasoline plants and facilities; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

948. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report showing refunds of internal revenue in excess of \$500 made by the Bureau of Internal Revenue during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945, on account of taxes illegally or erroneously collected; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

949. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a copy of the Annual Report of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945; to the Committee on Agriculture.

950. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of officers and administrative offices delinquent in rendering or transmitting accounts, and officers delinquent in payment of final balances, for the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

951. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting, in compliance with the provisions of the act of July 28, 1916, a re-

port of all cases where special contracts are made with railroad companies for the transportation of the mails, and the terms and reasons therefor; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

952. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the Annual Report of the Food and Drug Administration for the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

953. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, in compliance with the provisions of section 19a of the Interstate Commerce Act, copies of final valuations of properties of carriers subject to the act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

954. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting the Fifty-ninth Annual Report of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

955. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report on the receipts, expenditures, and results of cooperative agricultural extension work for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945; to the Committee on Agriculture.

956. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the Annual Report of St. Elizabeths Hospital for the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

957. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the Annual Report of the American Printing House for the Blind, Columbia Institution for the Deaf, Howard University, Office of Community War Services, and Committee on Physical Fitness for the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

958. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a report of activities of the Veterans' Administration as of June 30, 1945; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

959. A letter from the president, Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., transmitting the Annual Report of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory for the fiscal year 1945 (H. Doc. No. 396); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 1545. An act to amend article 38 of the Articles for the Government of the Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1473). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLE of New York: Committee on Naval Affairs. House Joint Resolution 300. Joint resolution to authorize the President to appoint Rear Adm. Earle W. Mills, United States Navy, to the office of Chairman and member of the United States Maritime Commission and Administrator of the War Shipping Administration without affecting his naval status and perquisites; without amendment (Rept. No. 1474). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 4896. A bill to provide for payment of travel allowances and transportation, and for transportation of dependents and shipment of household effects, of members of the naval forces upon separation from active service, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1475). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. R. 5158. A bill reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ELSAESSER:

H. R. 5159. A bill to authorize the payment of premiums on national service life insurance and United States Government life insurance at United States post offices; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 5160. A bill to provide additional compensation for veterans of World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 5161. A bill to authorize certain administrative expenditures incident to the conservation of the public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H. R. 5162. A bill to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads, and to protect the public by requiring certain common carriers by railroad to install and maintain communications systems; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 5163. A bill with respect to the filing of claims of the United States based upon debts of deceased persons; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MANASCO:

H. R. 5164. A bill to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to designate the Department of State as the disposal agency for surplus property outside the continental United States, its Territories, and possessions; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 5165. A bill for the relief of Efsthios Georgas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 5166. A bill for the relief of Raphael Elder; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H. R. 5167. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Minerva C. Davis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 5168. A bill granting a pension to Oscar O. Cox; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee (by request):

H. R. 5169. A bill for the relief of Ira Ellis Veal; to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1461. By Mr. HAYS: Petition of J. H. Raney and 115 others of Mayflower, Ark.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1462. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition containing the signatures of 157 citizens of the Thirtieth Congressional District, State of New York, advocating the enactment by the Congress of the original full-employment bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1463. By Mr. LANDIS: Petition of 30,000 war mothers of the United States, pertaining to a bonus for veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1464. By Mr. WELCH: Resolution No. 5194 of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, urging reconsideration of action whereby western half of United States was eliminated from consideration as location of permanent site for United Nations Organization; commending Mayor Lapham for his efforts and endorsing his program in connection therewith; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1465. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition signed by 71 residents of Macomb County, Mich., expressing interest in H. R. 1648, a bill to prohibit interference with the broadcasting of noncommercial radio programs by educational institutions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1466. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the National Association of Women Lawyers, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of H. R. 4502; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1467. Also, petition of the Philadelphia County Council of American Veterans of World War II, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to veteran representation on investigating committees; to the Committee on Rules.

1468. Also, petition of the Philippine-Hawaii-America Labor Union, Inc., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their request for intervention by the High Commissioner to the Philippines against the proclamation of President Osmeña to hold election for national elective officials only; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 18, 1946

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, in this still moment, make us vividly aware of Thy divine invasion through all the areas of our yearning lives; give us the grace of hospitality to the highest. As citizens of a world that carries on its bent shoulders a burden of suffering greater than humanity has ever borne, make us inwardly adequate to be Thy ministers of reconciliation.

May the poisoning evils which blight the earth not devastate our inner lives, subduing us to its low standards, confusing us by its chaos, or crushing our faith under its tragedy. Clothed in the undefiled garments of love's pure vestment, may we walk with Thee in white as in the spirit of the Master we face the infinite pathos of the troubled world we fain would serve before we fall on sleep. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF SENATORS

ALBERT W. HAWKES, a Senator from the State of New Jersey; JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, a Senator from the State of Wyoming; and CLAUDE PEPPER, a Senator from the State of Florida, appeared in their seats today.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. CHAVEZ. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	Morse
Andrews	Gossett	Murray
Austin	Green	O'Daniel
Bailey	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Ball	Gurney	Overton
Bankhead	Hart	Pepper
Barkley	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hayden	Revercomb
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Russell
Bridges	Hill	Saltonstall
Briggs	Hoey	Shipstead
Buck	Huffman	Smith
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Stanfill
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Byrd	La Follette	Taft
Capehart	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McCarran	Tobey
Cordon	McClellan	Tydings
Donnell	McFarland	Walsh
Downey	McKellar	Wherry
Eastland	McMahon	White
Ellender	Magnuson	Wiley
Ferguson	Maybank	Willis
Fulbright	Mead	Wilson
George	Millikin	Young

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business as a representative of the United States attending the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, now being held in London.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] is absent on official business as a member of the Mead committee.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business as a representative of the United States attending the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, now being held in London.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent on official business as a member of the Mead committee.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is necessarily absent from the city.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] is unavoidably absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday be approved without reading.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall